

The Signs of the Times, vol. 16

*esr*

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1890	6
January 6, 1890	6
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:8-13" The Signs of the Times, 16, 1.	6
NOTES	7
ADDITIONAL NOTES	8
January 13, 1890	11
"Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law" The Signs of the Times, 16, 2.	11
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:8-13" The Signs of the Times, 16, 2.	15
NOTES	17
ADDITIONAL NOTES	18
January 20, 1890	20
"What and Where Is Paradise?" The Signs of the Times, 16, 3.	20
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:6-13" The Signs of the Times, 16, 3.	22
NOTES	24
January 27, 1890	29
"The Wickedness of Church and State Union" The Signs of the Times, 16, 4.	29
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:1-7" The Signs of the Times, 16, 4.	32
NOTES	34
February 3, 1890	36
"Obedience Past and Present" The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.	36
"The Puritan Idea" The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.	39
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:8-14" The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.	42
NOTE	44
"What the Gospel Teaches" The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.	44
February 10, 1890	48
"A Sunday Law for the District of Columbia" The Signs of the Times, 16, 6.	48
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:15-20" The Signs of the Times, 16, 6.	50
NOTES	52
ADDITIONAL NOTE	52
February 17, 1890	54
"Sunday-Law Petitions" The Signs of the Times, 16, 7.	54
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:20-23" The Signs of the Times, 16, 7.	56
NOTES	58
February 24, 1890	60
"A Movement to Unite Church and State" The Signs of the Times, 16, 8.	60
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:24-28" The Signs of the Times, 16, 8.	63
NOTE	66
March 3, 1890	68
"Good Words in a Sunday Convention" The Signs of the Times, 16, 9.	68
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:1-9" The Signs of the Times, 16, 9.	72
NOTE	74
March 10, 1890	75
"Religion and the Church" The Signs of the Times, 16, 10.	75
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:10-20" The Signs of the Times, 16, 10.	78
NOTES	80
March 17, 1890	82
"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:21-25" The Signs of the Times, 16, 11.	82

NOTE	84
ADDITIONAL NOTES	84
<b>March 31, 1890</b>	<b>88</b>
"Another Sunday Prosecution in Tennessee" The Signs of the Times, 16, 13.	88
<b>April 21, 1890</b>	<b>91</b>
"Sound Speech from a Baptist" The Signs of the Times, 16, 16.	91
<b>April 28, 1890</b>	<b>95</b>
"The Fresno Camp-meeting" The Signs of the Times, 16, 17.	95
<b>May 12, 1890</b>	<b>97</b>
"Saving Faith" The Signs of the Times, 16, 19.	97
<b>May 19, 1890</b>	<b>100</b>
"A Few Principles of Interpretation" The Signs of the Times, 16, 19.	100
<b>May 26, 1890</b>	<b>103</b>
"Things We Should Know" The Signs of the Times, 16, 20.	103
<b>June 2, 1890</b>	<b>108</b>
"Things We Should Know. No. 2" The Signs of the Times, 16, 21.	108
<b>June 9, 1890</b>	<b>112</b>
"Christ, the Sinless One" The Signs of the Times, 16, 22.	112
"Newspaper Reading as a Preparation for Church" The Signs of the Times, 16, 22.	114
<b>June 16, 1890</b>	<b>118</b>
"Unrighteous Judgment, Self-Condernation" The Signs of the Times, 16, 23.	118
"The Sabbath-School. Trust in Our Heavenly Father. Luke 12:22-34" The Signs of the Times, 16, 23.	122
<b>June 23, 1890</b>	<b>127</b>
"Goodness Leading to Repentance. Romans 2:4" The Signs of the Times, 16, 24.	127
"The Baptism of Fire" The Signs of the Times, 16, 24.	131
"The Sabbath-School. Notes on the International Lesson. Height of Mercy" The Signs of the Times, 16, 24.	134
<b>June 30, 1890</b>	<b>138</b>
"According to His Deeds. Romans 1:5, 6" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.	138
"Now" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.	140
"The Righteousness which Is in the Law" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.	142
"Notes on the International Lesson. Lawful Work on the Sabbath. Luke 13:10-17" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.	146
"A Timely Reminder" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.	149
<b>July 7, 1890</b>	<b>151</b>
"Did Abraham Think that God Would Provide a Lamb?" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.	151
"Seek for Immortality" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.	152
"Is It Civil?" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.	156
"The Only Example" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.	156
"Positive Testimony" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.	158
"What Think Ye of Christ?" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.	159
<b>July 14, 1890</b>	<b>160</b>
"The Indwelling Word" The Signs of the Times, 16, 27.	160
"The Advantage of the Jew" The Signs of the Times, 16, 27.	164
"Taking Up the Cross. Luke 11:23-25" The Signs of the Times, 16, 27.	166
<b>July 21, 1890</b>	<b>170</b>
"Front Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.	170
"Sinning Without Law" The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.	171
"Pleading for Persecution" The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.	174

“The Eight-day Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.	176
“Notes on the International Lesson. Lost and Found. Luke 15:1-10” The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.	179
<b>July 28, 1890</b>	<b>183</b>
“Church Union” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.	183
“Communion Wine” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.	185
“The True Circumcision. Romans 2:17-29” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.	186
“Notes on the International Lesson. The Prodigal Son. Luke 15:22-21” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.	191
<b>August 4, 1890</b>	<b>194</b>
“The Penalty of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.	194
“Sunday in California” The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.	196
“The Golden Rule Ignored” The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.	198
“The Rich Man and Lazarus. Luke 16:19-31” The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.	201
<b>August 11, 1890</b>	<b>207</b>
“The Sure Foundation” The Signs of the Times, 16, 31.	207
“Romans 3:9-12” The Signs of the Times, 16, 31.	210
“The Ten Lepers. Luke 17:11-19” The Signs of the Times, 16, 31.	214
<b>August 18, 1890</b>	<b>219</b>
“The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.	219
“The Day which the Lord Hath Made” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.	222
“Getting Even” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.	224
“Christ Will Come” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.	224
“Resolutions Not Sufficient” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.	226
“Prevailing Prayer. Luke 18:1-14” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.	227
<b>August 25, 1890</b>	<b>233</b>
“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.	233
“Romans 3:9-12. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.	233
“Sunday-law Argument” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.	238
“N. R. J.’ and the ‘Civil Sabbath’” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.	241
“Entering the Kingdom. Luke 18:15-30” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.	248
<b>September 1, 1890</b>	<b>252</b>
“The Original Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.	252
“No Justification by the Law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.	255
“Throughout Their Generations” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.	259
<b>September 8, 1890</b>	<b>261</b>
“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	261
“How Righteousness Is Obtained” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	261
“Hope” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	266
“A Good Utterance” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	266
“An Unanswerable Argument” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	268
“Millennial Conversion” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	269
“Protestantism and Persecution” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	270
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.	271
<b>September 15, 1890</b>	<b>274</b>
“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.	274
“Is the Seventh-day Sabbath Binding Upon Christians?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.	282
“No California Sunday-law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.	282
“Destroying the Foundations” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.	282
<b>September 22, 1890</b>	<b>286</b>

"Front Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.	286
"Not a Debt, But a Gift. Romans 4:1-8" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.	287
"Is It Personal Rights or Selfishness?" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.	291
"Reading the Bible" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.	292
"Righteousness Is Life" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.	293
"Progress of Arbitration" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.	294
<b>September 29, 1890</b>	<b>296</b>
"The Blessing of Abraham" The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.	296
"Law in Force" The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.	300
"The Parable of the Vineyard. International Lesson Notes. Luke 20:9-19" The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.	301
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.	304
<b>October 6, 1890</b>	<b>307</b>
"Front Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 39.	307
"That Blessed Hope" The Signs of the Times, 16, 39.	308
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 39.	312
<b>October 13, 1890</b>	<b>314</b>
"Front Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.	314
"For Our Sake Also. Romans 4:17-25" The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.	314
"A Superficial Age" The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.	317
"Unprofitable" The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.	318
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.	320
<b>October 20, 1890</b>	<b>322</b>
"Principles and Precepts" The Signs of the Times, 16, 41.	322
"A Serious 'Drawback'" The Signs of the Times, 16, 41.	325
"Back Page: Sun-god" The Signs of the Times, 16, 41.	327
<b>October 27, 1890</b>	<b>329</b>
"Front Page: Golden Rule" The Signs of the Times, 16, 42.	329
"Salvation—Present and Future" The Signs of the Times, 16, 42.	330
<b>November 3, 1890</b>	<b>333</b>
"Life and Death Opposite Terms" The Signs of the Times, 16, 43.	333
<b>December 1, 1890</b>	<b>336</b>
"The Love of God" The Signs of the Times, 16, 47.	336
<b>December 29, 1890</b>	<b>342</b>
"How Readest Thou?" The Signs of the Times, 16, 51.	342

# 1890

## January 6, 1890

“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:8-13” The Signs of the Times, 16, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

### (Lesson 16, January 15, 1890.)

1. What was the old covenant that was made with Israel? *Exodus 19:5-8; 24:3-8. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.1*
2. How does the second covenant compare with the first? *Hebrews 8:6. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.2*
3. What was the necessity for the second covenant? *Verse 7. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.3*
4. Since the second covenant is better than the first, in that it is founded upon better promises, wherein must the first have been faulty? Ans.-In the promises. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.4*
5. What were the promises of the first covenant? *Exodus 19:8; 24:3, 7. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.5*
6. What was God's covenant which the people promised to perform? *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.6*
7. What is said of the nature of those commandments? *Psalms 19:7; 119:172. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.7*
8. What of those who do them? *Psalms 119:1-3; Ecclesiastes 12:13. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.8*
9. Then could the children of Israel have promised anything better than to keep God's commandments? *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.9*
10. Wherein, then, was the fault? *Hebrews 8:8, first part. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.10*

11. What did the people really promise to do? *Exodus 19:5, 6, 8.* See note. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.11*

12. What cannot the law do? *Romans 3:20.* *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.12*

13. What renders the law thus powerless? *Romans 8:3.* *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.13*

14. What is all human righteousness? *Isaiah 64:6.* *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.14*

15. What is the only true righteousness? *Philippians 3:9.* *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.15*

16. In the terms of the first covenant do we find any mention of faith, or of divine assistance? *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.16*

#### NOTES

Let the student note that the promises in the old covenant were really all on the part of the people. God said, "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant [the ten commandments], then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people.... and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." God did not say that he would make them such, but that they would be such a people if they obeyed his commandments. It could not be otherwise. The keeping of God's holy law would constitute them a holy people; and as such they would indeed be a peculiar treasure, even as are all who are zealous of good works. All that was set before them was simply what would result from obedience to the law, and that covenant contained no promises of help in doing that. Therefore the first covenant was a promise on the part of the people that they would make themselves holy. But this they could not do. The promise was a good one; with it alone there could be no fault; the fault lay with the people. The promise was faulty, through the weakness of the people who made it; just as we read in *Romans 8:3* that the law was weak through the flesh. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.17*

The first thought in the minds of many, on learning that in the first covenant the people made a promise which they could not possibly fulfill, is that God was unjust to require such a promise. And since they know that God is not unjust, they conclude that the first covenant must have contained pardon and promise of divine assistance, although it contained no hint of it. If the student will wait until the subject of the covenants is concluded, he will see the justice and the mercy of God's plan. But right here let us fasten these two thoughts: First, if the first covenant had contained pardon, and promise of divine assistance, there would have been no necessity of any other covenant. Pardon and divine aid are all that any soul can get, and if the first covenant had had these, it would not have been faulty. But, second, let it not be forgotten that the fact that there was no pardon, and no Holy Spirit's aid, in that covenant does not imply that there was no salvation for the people who lived under it. There was ample provision for them, but not in the first covenant. What the provision was, and why the first covenant was given, will be learned later. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.18*

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES

The preliminary steps of the old covenant are recorded in *Exodus 19:5-8*. We have (1) the words of the Lord to the people setting forth the conditions on which the people would be his peculiar treasure above all other nations; (2) the conditions, obedience to God's voice, or covenant; and (3) the promise of the people that they would do this. The Lord then utters his voice in the "ten words," and the covenant is afterward ratified, as recorded in *Exodus 24:3-8*. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.19*

God's covenant which he commanded the people to perform is expressly stated to be the ten commandments. *Deuteronomy 4:12, 16*. They are spoken of as "covenant" because they are the basis of every covenant which God ever made with man or concerning man. They are God's will, they reflect of his character. They were not, however, the covenant made at Horeb, for that was made concerning the ten commandments, or God's voice. Israel promised to obey God's voice before that voice was heard, and when it spoke it uttered the ten commandments and no more. *Deuteronomy 5:22*. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.20*



The old covenant was broken when Israel disobeyed God. They then forfeited their blessings and privileges, and the covenant became null and void. But their disobedience did not affect the holy law of God. The transgression of a law could not change it; and the proof that Israel transgressed God's law and thereby forfeited, or lost, their covenant blessings, proves the binding obligation of the law. If the transgression of a law would abolish it, no government would stand, and all authority and rule would be at an end; for it is true that from time immemorial men have transgressed law, and will transgress as long as the heart of man remains unregenerate. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.21*

The covenant made at Horeb is called the "old covenant" because it was first ratified, while in point of fact what is called the "new covenant" was made first, even in the beginning, with the race immediately after the fall. Its blessings and light were embraced through faith by righteous Abel. In fact, it was through faith in all the covenant implies that Abel became righteous. The same covenant was confirmed by the promise and oath of God unto Abraham. It was believed in by patriarch and prophet on the promise of God of what was to be. The covenant was at last ratified by the death of Christ upon the cross, when "the blood of the everlasting covenant" was shed. *Hebrews 13:20; Luke 22:20. SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.22*

It is to the "new covenant" that the term "everlasting covenant" refers. This is spoken of as the covenant made with David, but it in that case refers to David's seed, Christ, through whom the covenant was to be established, around whom all the blessings of the covenant clustered, through whom they all came. See *2 Samuel 23:5; Psalm 50:5; 89:28; Isaiah 24:5; 55:3; 61:8; Jeremiah 32:40; Ezekiel 16:60*, et al. It is called the "everlasting covenant," because it is the only means through which the blessings of God have come to fallen man from the beginning to the close of probation. It is synchronous with the "everlasting gospel." *Revelation 14:6*. The everlasting gospel is the glad tidings, or good news, of the everlasting covenant. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.23*

True righteousness embraces true motives. God judges acts by motives. If the act is to be worthy, the motive, and the heart which

prompts the motive, must be pure and right. But man's heart is by nature dominated by evil, is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. *Mark 7:21-23; Jeremiah 17:9*. As the fountain is therefore corrupt, the deeds must be. In order that man do righteous acts the heart must be made right. This God cleanses by his wondrous grace and mighty power through faith. He gives us a new heart. He imputes to us the righteousness of God. That righteousness covers all past sins, it issues through the life in present good works. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.24*

The old covenant, or the covenant at Horeb, knew no forgiveness. It gendered to bondage. *Galatians 4:24*. Bondage came from it. If man could have perfectly obeyed God's law, and had been released from all past sins, he would have had liberty under the old covenant. But that covenant could not forgive sin, neither could it change the heart. It gendered to bondage. But in the new covenant there is forgiveness, change of heart, light and knowledge of God, and a sinless life forevermore. *SITI January 6, 1890, page 10.25*

## January 13, 1890

**“Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law”** The Signs of the Times, 16, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Among right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as “Anarchists,” who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right for exercise authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earth monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law, which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the Creator and the supreme Ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that “the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will” (*Daniel 4:25*), and the statement of the apostle, that “the powers that be are ordained of God” (*Romans 13:1*), together with many other Scripture references to earthly governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist. *SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.26*

Admitting that earthly governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or, in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governments are sent by the Lord “for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well.” *1 Peter 2:13, 14*. Paul says also that the ruler is God’s minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. *Romans 13:4. SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.27*

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what

laws earthly rulers are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the text first referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute *wrath*, need be such laws as God can approve—they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise; for since God's law is *perfect* (*Psalms* 19:7), covering in its range every act and thought (see *Ecclesiastes* 12:13, 14; *Hebrews* 4:12; *Matthew* 5:20-22, 27, 28), even, human law must be embraced with its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:—*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.28*

“Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And beside it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy, for with regard for such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. These human laws that assess a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in foro conscientia* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin as to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”—*Blackstone, vol. 1, p. 36. SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.29*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God, it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff

upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience or expediency.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.30*

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute wrath? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also divide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:-*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.31*

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good.” *Romans 13:1-4.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.32*

The “high powers” do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, some are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for *good*. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” *Acts 2:28.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.33*

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:-*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.34*

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely,

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” *Romans 13:8-10.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.35*

“He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law,” and “love is the fulfilling of the law.” What law?-Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” and, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” See *Matthew 22:36-40*. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue, showing to what law he refers when he says, “He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.” To make this still *more* emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that “love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is *the fulfilling* of the law.” Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor-loves his neighbor as himself-has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly governments are empowered to take notice.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.36*

Thus it is seen that Paul’s argument concerning the office of civil government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure anyone except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.37*

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates

another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from hating another, nor take any notice of hatred until it culminates in open crime.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.38*

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the act is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.39*

We see, then, how imperfect are human governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature-those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor-human governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone. E. J. W.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.40*

**"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:8-13" The Signs of the Times, 16, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 17, January 22, 1890)**

1. With whom was the old covenant made? *Jeremiah 31:31, 32.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.41*

2. With whom did the Lord say he would make a new covenant? *Hebrews 8:8.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.42*

3. Have Gentiles any part in the covenants? *Ephesians 2:11, 12.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.43*

4. What were the promises of the old covenant?*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.44*

5. What did the people really bind themselves to do?*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.45*
6. Wherein was that covenant faulty?*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.46*
7. What made the promises faulty?*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.47*
8. In what was the second covenant better than the first? *Hebrews 8:6.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.48*
9. Repeat the promises of the new covenant. *Verses 10-12; Jeremiah 31:33, 34.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.49*
10. Who makes these promises?*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.50*
11. What is the order of their fulfillment? See note.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.51*
12. What is meant by putting the law into the minds of the people?  
Ans.-So impressing it upon their minds that they would not forget it, and causing them to delight in it, and acknowledge its holiness.  
*Romans 7:12, 22.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.52*
13. What is meant by writing it in their hearts? Ans.-Making it the rule of their lives, the spring of all their actions. In other words, making it a part of them.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.53*
14. What is said of those in whose hearts the law of God is? *Psalms 119:11; 37:31.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.54*
15. Whom will such a one be like? *Psalms 40:7, 8.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.55*
16. What will be the characteristic of those who have the law written in their hearts? *Titus 2:14.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.56*
17. Is not this the object set before the people in the first covenant? *Exodus 19:5, 6.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.57*
18. Then wherein is the great difference between the first covenant



and the second? Ans.-In the first covenant the people promised to make themselves holy; in the second, God says that he will do the work for them.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.58*

19. In order that this work may be done, what must men do? *James 4:7, first clause; 1 Peter 5:6; Romans 6:13.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.59*

20. What is the reason why man who profess to desire righteousness do not obtain it? *Romans 10:3.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.60*

21. If they would humble themselves and submit to God, what would he do for them? *Isaiah 61:10.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.61*

22. Through whom alone can this righteousness be obtained? *Romans 5:17, 19.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.62*

23. What is the condition on which it is given? *Romans 3:22.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.63*

#### NOTES

The first of the blessings of the gospel is the forgiveness of sins. The term for this in the quotation in Hebrews is. "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness." The next is the writing of the law in the hearts of the people. Then comes the final blotting out of sins: "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." And then comes the close of probation, and the eternal inheritance, when "they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." *Jeremiah 31:34.* Then all the people will be taught of the Lord. *Isaiah 54:13.SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.64*

Israel were indeed be called the people of God; but his dealings with them abundantly prove, what the New Testament plainly declares, that only the faithful are really Israel, and no others were truly his people. The Lord sent word to Pharaoh, saying, "Let my

people go, that they may serve me.” Again he said, “Israel is my son, even my firstborn.” He also said he had seen the affliction of his people, and had come to deliver them, and to bring them into the land of Canaan. He did indeed deliver them out of Egypt, but of all the host that went out, only two were brought into the land of Canaan. The rest fell in the desert because of their unbelief. When they rebelled against God, they cut themselves off from being his people. And as he said in the prophecy, and in the text we have been considering, when they refused to continue in his covenant, he regarded them not. To be the people of God in truth, we must have his law in our hearts. *SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.65*

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES

The old covenant was made with Israel, at Horeb; the new covenant was ratified with the house of Israel when Jesus died upon the cross. To Israel belonged “the covenants,” both the old and new. *Romans 9:4*. The Gentiles have no promise in that covenant whatever, only as they become a part of Israel. Paul says in *Ephesians 2:12* that the Gentiles were “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise.” It is sometimes said that the Sabbath is “Jewish,” but those who say this hardly realize the import of their words. If the Sabbath is Jewish, so also is the new covenant, through which all the blessings and promises come, so also is our Lord. “Salvation is of the Jews.” *John 4:22. SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.66*

But God has not rejected the Gentiles nor barred the way to their salvation. Those who were aliens may become citizens with the saints. A way has been opened, a “new and living way,” even the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. He died for all, and brings the Gentiles nigh by his blood. If we accept of his gracious provisions of this new covenant, if we through faith lay hold on this divine Redeemer, we become a part of Israel. *Ephesians 2:13-20*. We are “Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” *Galatians 3:29*. Becoming through faith in Christ a part of the Israel of God, we will not only heed the precepts to Israel, but will share the promises. We will not reject God’s moral law as Jewish, but will rejoice that that law in its entirety and fullness may all be written upon our very hearts. *SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.67*

He who has an abiding affection for the law of God, will not fail of His kingdom. He will not sin against God (*Psalms 119:11*); none of his steps shall slide (*Psalms 37:31*); he will have no stumblingblock (*Psalms 119:165*, margin). Men's failures are our stumbling-blocks. Those who fail generally lay the blame to that or those over which or whose acts they stumble. But that over which they stumble is not the cause of stumbling, it is only the occasion; it is simply used for an excuse. They would stumble over something else if not that.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.68*

Many stumble over come act of a brother or sister which they do not consider right. They have had some deal with their brethren, have not gotten a good bargain, and they say, "If such a man is a Christian, we will have no more to do with religion," and off they go, their steps slide. The brother with whom they dealt may have done wrong. Others may have upheld him in that wrong, but is all this and a thousand times more, a reason why anyone should turn from the Lord? We are not called to serve man, but God. *Revelation 14:6, 7*. All men are frail and erring. God never fails. If we are serving him, if we love his law, none of these things will move us. It may lead to less confidence in man; it should not shake confidence in God. "Great peace have they which have thy law, and they have none occasion of stumbling." *Psalms 119:165*, margin. Revised Version. There is not only no cause, but they will take nothing for an occasion or excuse. Let us always remember that whenever we make anyone else's failure to do right an occasion of doing wrong ourselves, our heart is not right, the law of God is not written on the heart. God will not fail us; he cannot fail.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 10.69*

Submission from the heart is most precious in God's sight. It implies humility, meekness, and faith. We would not submit to God unless we believed him. We would not submit unless we were willing to learn his way in the spirit of meekness. We would not submit unless we realized our own nothingness and God's greatness. Therefore it is only the humble, meek, trusting heart that truly submits to God. Such God will clothe with his righteousness and will keep from evil.*SITI January 13, 1890, page 27.1*

## January 20, 1890

**“What and Where Is Paradise?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

“And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee to-day, shalt thou be with me in paradise.” *Luke 23:42, 43. SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.2*

This language will be recognized at once as the request of the penitent thief who was crucified with Jesus, and the reply of our Lord. It has been the subject of an unlimited amount of controversy, and doubtless will be as long as men choose to interpret the Bible according to their system of theology, instead of deriving their system of theology wholly from the Bible. We do not design at this time to give a detailed exposition of the text, but simply to note a few points concerning paradise. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.3*

From Christ's language to Mary, recorded in *John 20:17*, three days after the crucifixion, it is very evident that he did not go to heaven on the day when he gave the thief the solemn assurance that they should meet in paradise. On account of this text, many who cling tenaciously to the idea that Jesus did not actually die, argue that Christ did go to paradise that day, but that paradise is not in heaven. Then they connect this text with their erroneous reading of *1 Peter 3:18-20*, and conclude that paradise is a sort of half-way house—an intermediate place between earth and heaven—where all souls, both good and bad, are retained until the judgment. In short, paradise is made identical with hades. A very few texts will suffice to show that this is a most erroneous conclusion. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.4*

First, however, we wish to call attention to the fact that if this definition of paradise were true, the Saviour's promise to the thief would be made nonsense. If paradise were only a place where souls remain between death and the final judgment, then Christ's promise to the penitent thief would amount simply to this: To-day shalt thou be with me in the place of the dead! There would

certainly be nothing very comforting about that, and nothing that would require the exercise of much faith, seeing both Jesus and the thief were at that time hanging on the cross; but this is what Christ's answer meant, if the theory be true that paradise and hades are identical. This fact alone should be sufficient to show the fallacy of such a view.*SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.5*

There are only three places in the Bible where the word "paradise" is used. One is in the text quoted at the beginning of this article. The second is in *2 Corinthians 12:2-4*, which we quote:-*SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.6*

"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth); such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth); how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."*SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.7*

This text proves conclusively that paradise is not an intermediate place between earth and heaven, but that it is heaven itself. In the first place, Paul says that he (for he speaks of himself) was caught up into the third heaven, and then in repeating the statement for emphasis, he says that he was caught up into paradise. Then Christ's promise to the thief on the cross involved nothing less than that the thief should be with him in the third heaven.*SITI January 20, 1890, page 27.8*

In *Revelation 2:7* we find the following promise, given by the Spirit:-*SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.1*

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God."*SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.2*

From this text we learn that paradise contains the tree of life. Turn now to *Revelation 22:1, 2*, and read: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it (that is of the city, see preceeding chapter), and on either side of the river, was

there, the tree of life.” Here we learn that the tree of life is in the midst of the New Jerusalem, which contains the throne of God. But the tree of life is in the midst of the paradise of God (*Revelation 2:7*); therefore we must conclude that the paradise of God is in the midst of the city of God, and that whoever goes to paradise goes into the immediate presence of God. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.3*

“Paradise” is an Anglocised Greek word meaning a park or a beautiful garden. Earthly cities have parks and pleasure gardens, and the heavenly Jerusalem has one also, but as much more beautiful than earthly gardens as the city who builder and maker is God is grander than cities built by man. Now compare this with *Ezekiel 28:13*: “Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the ardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold.” Read with this the description of New Jerusalem, which contains the paradise of God, that “there shall in nowise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.” *Revelation 21:27*. This, together with *Revelation 2:7* and *22:14*, teaches us that entrance into paradise, and enjoyment of its delights, is to be the reward of them who shall overcome through faith in Christ. But the righteous are rewarded only at the coming of the Lord in his kingdom and the resurrection of the just (*Matthew 16:27; 23:31; Luke 14:14*); and that was just what the thief asked for in the words, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.” E. J. W. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.4*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 8:6-13” The Signs of the Times, 16, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

### **(Lesson 18, February 1, 1890)**

1. In what does the difference between the old covenant and the new consist? *Hebrews 8:6. SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.5*

2. What were the promises of the old covenant? *SITI January 20,*

1890, page 42.6

3. What are those of the new? *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.7*

4. Was there any promise of pardon in the old covenant? See *Exodus 19:3-8; 24:3-8*. These scriptures contain the complete record of the making of the old covenant, but they contain no hint of pardon, or of any help through Christ. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.8*

5. Then how did people under the old covenant find salvation? *Hebrews 9:14, 15. SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.9*

6. Was there actual forgiveness for the people at the very time they sinned? or was forgiveness deferred until the death of Christ? *Psalms 32:5; 78:38*. Enoch and Elijah were taken to Heaven, which shows that they had received the same fullness of blessing that those will receive who live until the Lord comes. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.10*

7. Since there was present and complete salvation for men who lived under the old covenant, and forgiveness of the transgressions that were under the first covenant came only through the second, what must we conclude? Ans.-That the second covenant really existed at the same time as, and even before, the first covenant. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.11*

8. Tell again what is included in the blessings of the second covenant? *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.12*

9. What will be received by those whose transgressions are forgiven through the new covenant? *Hebrews 9:15*, last clause. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.13*

10. Whose children are all they who are heirs of the eternal inheritance? *Galatians 3:29. SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.14*

11. Of how many is Abraham the father? *Romans 4:11, 12. SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.15*

12. Did Abraham have righteousness? *Genesis 26:5. SITI January*

20, 1890, page 42.16

13. How did he obtain this righteousness? *Romans 4:3; Galatians 3:6.* *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.17*

14. Through whom did Abraham receive this righteousness? *Galatians 3:14, first part.* *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.18*

15. Then could the covenant with Abraham have lacked anything? Ans.-No; having Christ, it had all that can be desired—"all things that pertain to life and godliness." *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.19*

16. Since all the blessings which people receive through the new covenant, they receive as children of Abraham, can there be any difference between the second covenant and the covenant with Abraham? *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.20*

17. How long before the old covenant was the covenant with Abraham made? *Galatians 3:17.* *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.21*

18. Then why was that "first" covenant made? See notes. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.22*

#### NOTES

The question has often been asked, How could any be saved under the old covenant, if there was no pardon in that covenant? That there was no pardon in that covenant is readily seen: 1. There is no hint of pardon in the covenant itself, as recorded in *Exodus 19:5-8*, or in the reiteration and ratification of it in *chap. 24:3-8*, 2. In the sanctuary service there was no blood offered that could take away sin. *Hebrews 10:4*. There was therefore no chance for pardon in that covenant. But to say they were under that covenant settles nothing as to what was in the covenant. All were under that covenant who lived while it endured. But that was not all. They were "beloved for the Father's sake." As children of Abraham, they were also under the Abrahamic covenant, of which their circumcision was the token. *John 7:22; Genesis 17:9-14*. This was a covenant of faith, already confirmed by the word and oath of the Lord, in Christ, the Seed, and it was not disannulled by any future arrangement.



*Galatians 3:15-17*. All who were of faith were blessed with faithful Abraham. *Verses 6-9*. Overlooking this plain fact, which indeed lies at the very foundation of gospel faith in the new covenant, which is but the development of the Abrahamic, some have ascribed salvation to the covenant at Horeb. But, according to both Scripture and reason, if salvation had been possible in that covenant, there was no need of the second. *Hebrews 7:11; 10:1*, etc. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.23*

Though much dissatisfaction is expressed by commentators with the received rendering of *Hebrews 9:1*, their suggestions do not make it very greatly different. The first covenant is said to have had ordinances of divine service and a sanctuary for this world. But these were superadditions, not at all necessary to the covenant, but quite necessary as types of the sacrifice and priesthood of the new covenant. They all recognized the existence of sin; but no sin was taken away by them. *Hebrews 10:3, 4*. As a sanctuary of this world, and offerings that could not take away sin, were connected to that covenant, these things themselves were but recognitions of the fact that there was no pardon in that covenant. By those things the people expressed faith in the mediation of the new covenant. If any pardon had been contained in that covenant, we must conclude that some means would have been devised to make that fact manifest. But there was not. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.24*

The word sanctuary means a holy place, or the dwelling-place of God. Indeed, the same word is often used in the Hebrew for sanctuary and holiness. All can see that it is derived from a verb which signifies to sanctify or make holy. The sanctuary being a holy dwelling, and being divided into two rooms each of course was a holy place. And each is called *the holy*. See *Leviticus 16:2*. Here the word "holy" is used, and we learn only by the description-within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark-that the inner holy is meant. Inasmuch as in the second was placed the ark, containing the tables of stone on which were the commandments-the most sacred things committed to them,-it was called the most holy, or, properly, according to the Hebrew, the holy of the holies. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.25*

What was in the ark? Few subjects have occasioned more

perplexity than this description of what was in the ark. The apostle specifies, as being in the holy place, only the candlestick and the table upon which was the bread; whereas it is certain that the golden altar of incense was also therein. Moses had direction to put the two tables of testimony in the ark. *Exodus 26:16, 21*. This order he obeyed. *Exodus 40:29; Deuteronomy 10:5*. But we do not read of his putting anything else in the ark, or of his being ordered to do so. In *1 Kings 8:9* it is distinctly said that “there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel.” This was spoken of the time when the vessels of the sanctuary were brought into their appropriate places in the temple built by Solomon. Dr. Clarke says:-*SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.26*

“As Calmet remarks, in the temple which was afterwards built, there were many things added which were not in the tabernacle, and several things left out. The ark of the covenant and the two tables of the law were never found after the return from the Babylonish captivity. We have no proof that, even in the time of Solomon, the golden pot of manna, or the rod of Aaron, was either in or near the ark.... We need not trouble ourselves to reconcile the various scriptures which mention these subjects, some of which refer to the tabernacle, others to Solomon’s temple, and others to the temple built by Zorobabel, which places were very different from each other.”*SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.27*

That changes took place is evident. If Paul wrote of the tabernacle in the days of Moses, then the rod of Aaron and the pot of manna had been removed from the ark before the time of Solomon, which some suggest might have occurred while the ark was in the hands of the Philistines. Or, otherwise, Paul was speaking of things as they existed some time after Solomon, of which we have no account in the Scriptures. Which is the case is not at all material.*SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.28*

None should allow themselves to be confused by the terms first covenant and second covenant. While the covenant made at Sinai was called “the first covenant,” it is by no means the first covenant that God ever made with man. Long before that he made a covenant with Abraham, and he also made a covenant with Noah,

and with Adam. Neither must it be supposed that the first or old covenant existed for a period of time as the only covenant with the people before the promise of the second or new covenant could be shared. If that had been the case, then during that time there would have been no pardon for the people. What is called the “second covenant” virtually existed before the covenant was made at Sinai; for the covenant with Abraham was confirmed in Christ (*Galatians 3:17*); and it is only through Christ that there is any value to what is known as the second covenant. There is no blessing that can be gained by virtue of the second covenant that was not promised to Abraham. And we, with whom the second covenant is made, can share the inheritance which it promises only by being children of Abraham. To be Christ’s is the same as to be children of Abraham (*Galatians 3:29*); all who are of faith are the children of Abraham and share in his blessing (*verses 7-9*); and since no one can have anything except as children of Abraham, it follows that there is nothing in what is called the second covenant that was not in the covenant made with Abraham. The second covenant existed in every feature long before the first, even from the days of Adam. It is called “second” because both its ratification by blood and its more minute statement were after that of the covenant made at Sinai. More than this, it was the second covenant made with the Jewish people. The one from Sinai was the *first* made with that nation. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 42.29*

When it is demonstrated that the first covenant-the Sinaitic covenant-contained no provisions for pardon of sins, some will at once say, “But they *did* have pardon under that covenant.” The trouble arises from a confusion of terms. It is not denied that *under* the old covenant, *i.e.*, during the time when it was specially in force, there was pardon of sins, but that pardon was not offered in the old covenant, and could not be secured by virtue of it. The pardon was secured by virtue of something else, as shown by *Hebrews 9:15*. Not only was there the opportunity of finding free pardon of sins, and grace to help in time of need, during the time of the old covenant, but the same opportunity existed before that covenant was made, by virtue of God’s covenant with Abraham, which differs in no respect from that made with Adam and Eve, except that we have the particulars given more in detail. We see, then, that there was no necessity for provisions to be made in the Sinaitic covenant

for forgiveness of sins. The plan of salvation was developed long before the gospel was preached to Abraham (*Galatians 3:8*), and was amply sufficient to save to the uttermost all who would accept it. The covenant at Sinai, was made for the purpose of making the people see the necessity of accepting the gospel. *SITI January 20, 1890, page 43.1*

## January 27, 1890

**“The Wickedness of Church and State Union”** *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In the last number of the last volume of the *SIGNS OF THE TIMES* in answer to a question, we showed how impossible it is that civil government should have anything to do with the moral law. The argument, in brief, was that the law is spiritual, and civil government cannot enforce spirituality, nor punish for the lack of this. In continuation of that line of thought, we wish to show the consequences that must necessarily result from carrying into practice the idea that it is the province of the civil government to enforce the divine law. We shall do this by making a few quotations. In the Senate document containing the hearing (December 13, 1889) before the Committee on Education and Labor, on the Sunday-Rest bill, we find on pages 65, and 66 certain statements made by Senator Blair, the chairman of the committee, and the author of the bill. He first asked Dr. Lewis the following questions:-*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.2*

“Suppose that human beings trying to live in accordance with the will of God, re-enact his law and write it in their statute-book; is it wrong for society to put in the public law the requirement of obedience to God and his law?”*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.3*

And then after a few words he proceeded to answer his own question in the following manner:-*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.4*

“The will of God exists. He requires the observance of the seventh day just as he prohibits murder; and so we re-enact his law, in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath, going further or not so far, according to the various Legislatures.”*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.5*

Let the reader give particular attention to the idea advanced by Senator Blair, that human beings may re-enact the law of God. The same idea was advanced by Mr. Crafts in the *Christian Statements*

of May 30, 1889. Said he:-*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.6*

“The laws of our statute-books that re-enact the seventh commandment are as distinctly biblical in their origin as the laws that re-enact a part of the fourth commandment.”*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.7*

In what position does this place civil government? The only answer that can be given is that it puts it in the place of God, and makes it at least equal with God. Nay, more, in putting it in the place of God, it puts it above God; for if the State re-enacts and enforces the law of God, supposing such a thing to be possible, it takes the law out of his hands, leaving him nothing to do, and requires men to give supreme allegiance to the State. This will be more apparent when we quote another statement made by Senator Blair, in the connection before referred to. Said he:-*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.8*

“Now the question comes right to this point: God having ordained the Sabbath, as you concede with all religious organizations, here is the national government, which alone can make that law of God operative in this sphere of national action. Why shall not the civil government, then, re-enact that conceded law of the Almighty and make it effective?”*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.9*

Do we not say truly that the National Reform idea, as voiced here by Senator Blair, puts the State in the place of God? He believes that national government alone can make the law of God effective. We say, with as much reverence as the subject will allow, that we cannot see what use those who hold such an idea can have for God. They have usurped his prerogative.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.10*

In the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians the apostle Paul describes a certain power, known as the “man of sin,” the result of the working of the “mystery of iniquity.” This power is described as opposing and exalting itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, and claiming really to be God. It has generally been considered that this language is a description of the Papacy, and we believe that that interpretation is correct; but surely it describes nothing more accurately than a government which should attempt to

do just what Senator Blair says this government ought to do. Therefore, everyone who believes this language of Paul to refer to the Papacy must admit that a government according to the National Reform idea would be nothing more than an image to the Papacy.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.11*

But there is another point to be noticed in this connection, and that is the inevitable result of putting such ideas into practice. If it were universally conceded that the civil government has the power and the right to re-enact and enforce the law of God, that would involve the conclusion that there is no more to the moral law than civil government can enforce. The result would be the universal prevalence of immorality, and immorality of the worst kind, insomuch as the individuals would suppose themselves to be acting in harmony with divine law.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.12*

For example, take Mr. Blair's statement to the effect that as we re-enact the law of God in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath. Suppose the National Reform scheme has become triumphant, and it is understood that the government takes the place of God, and enforces the divine law against murder, the result would be that any individual who did not in his envy and hatred toward his fellows go to the extreme of depriving them of life, would consider himself a moral man, although he might be full of hatred, malice, and envy. Take Mr. Craft's idea that the State re-enacts the seventh commandment. It needs no argument to show that the State cannot punish man for vicious thoughts, or evil desires, or for any grade of licentiousness short of the overt act of adultery. But ministers and law-makers teach that the State enforce the seventh commandment; therefore the conclusion which the libertine would be warranted in making would be that he is a moral man if he abstains from violence. And so, when this National Reform idea shall be carried into effect, we shall have the State actually teaching vice and immorality.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.13*

Such a condition of things would be a union of Church and State in its fullest extent. The Dark Ages stand as the great example of the effects of the union of Church and State, yet all that was done then was the enforcement by civil government of what the church

claimed was the law of God. We think that our friends can readily see from this that when the United States, or any other government, legislates concerning any one or the whole of the commandments, it effects just to that extent a union of Church and State; and the argument already given shows how dangerous to morality and pure religion is such a union. The state of morality will be just as much below the true morality as the power that pressures to enforce the law of God is below God. Are there any of our Christian readers who wish to see such a condition of things in the United States, or who will lend their influence to bring it about? E. J. W.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.14*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:1-7” The Signs of the Times, 16, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 19, February 8, 1890)**

1. What does the apostle say that the first covenant had? *Hebrews 9:1.SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.15*
2. Were these a part of that covenant? See *Exodus 19:3-6; 24:3-8.SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.16*
3. What is meant by ordinances of divine service? Ans.-Ceremonies of divine appointment. There is no divine service without divine appointment.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.17*
4. What is meant by a worldly sanctuary? Ans.-A sanctuary of the world, in distinction from the one in heaven.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.18*
5. Where is the only real sanctuary? *Hebrews 8:1, 2.SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.19*
6. What relation did the worldly sanctuary and its services sustain to the heavenly? *Verse 5.SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.20*
7. How many apartments were in the tabernacle? *Hebrews 9:2, 3.SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.21*



8. What were the two apartments called? -*lb*. See note. *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.22*
9. What was in the holy? *Verse 2; Exodus 40:23-27. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.23*
10. What was in the holiest of all? *Hebrews 9:4. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.24*
11. What was in the ark? Compare *Exodus 25:31; 1 Kings 8:9*. See note. *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.25*
12. What was the cover of the ark called? *Hebrews 9:5; Exodus 25:21. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.26*
13. Why was it called the mercy-seat? Ans.-It was there that mercy was dispensed. The sanctuary was God's dwelling-place; the ark represented his throne; and from his throne he dispenses grace, or favor, or mercy. See *Hebrews 4:16. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.27*
14. How often did the priests go into the sanctuary? *Hebrews 9:5. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.28*
15. How often was there service in the most holy? *Verse 7. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.29*
16. Why was this service performed? *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.30*
17. What alone is sin? *1 John 3:4. SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.31*
18. What was the basis of the old covenant? *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.32*
19. What, then, was it that made it necessary for that covenant to have ordinances of divine service connected with it? *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.33*
20. Does the new covenant have ordinances of divine service? *Hebrews 9:1*. The word "also" indicates that it had already been

shown that the second covenant had ordinances of divine service. This was done in *chapter 7 and 8.SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.34*

21. Then what must be the basis of the second covenant?*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.35*

#### NOTES

*Hebrews 9:1* is a text that hinders many from seeing that all of God's blessings to man are gained by virtue of the second covenant, and not by the first. That text reads: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." This, together with the fact that when men complied with these ordinances of divine service, they were forgiven (*Leviticus 4*), seems to some conclusive evidence that the old covenant contained the gospel and its blessings. But forgiveness of sins was not secured by virtue of those offerings; "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." *Hebrews 10:4*. Forgiveness was obtained only by virtue of the promised sacrifice of Christ (*Hebrews 9:15*), the Mediator of the new covenant, their faith in whom was shown by their offerings. So it was by virtue of the second or new covenant that pardon was secured to those who offered the sacrifices provided for in the ordinances of divine service connected with the old or first covenant.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.36*

Moreover, those "ordinances of divine service" formed no part of the first covenant. If they had, they must have been mentioned in the making of that covenant; but they were not. They were connected with it, but not a part of it. They were simply the means by which the people acknowledged the justice of their condemnation to death for the violation of the law which they had covenanted to keep, and their faith in the Mediator of the new covenant.*SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.37*

In brief, then, God's plan in the salvation of sinners, whether now or in the days of Moses, is: The law sent home emphatically to the individual, to produce conviction of sin, and thus to drive the sinner to seek freedom; then, the acceptance of Christ's gracious

invitation, which was extended long before, but which the sinner would not listen to; and lastly, having accepted Christ, and being justified by faith, the manifestation of the faith, through the ordinances of the gospel, and the living of a life of righteousness by faith in Christ. *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.38*

The Bible, to one who is in the habit of devotedly reading it, begets in the soul a consciousness that excludes all doubt as to its truth. To that consciousness it comes with a self-evidencing power that is both sufficient and conclusive. That man spontaneously believes, and really has not time, or taste, or place in his soul for doubts. *SITI January 27, 1890, page 43.39*

## February 3, 1890

“Obedience Past and Present” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We have a letter from a lady in Alabama who is very much interested in the work of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES and the *American Sentinel*, and who is doing good work in distributing them among her friends. She writes a very kind and appreciative letter, and asks several pertinent questions, stating, what may readily be seen from the tone of the letter, that she is standing for truth and it open for conviction. The questions which she asks will receive due attention, but before answering them we wish to set our correspondent right upon other points which she incidentally mentions in her letter. We quote a paragraph:-*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.40*

“I believe that Christ was the end of the law of Moses. He was the fulfillment of the law. Moses’ law was only emblematic. While they kept it, it was imputed to them for righteousness. When Christ came he gave the same law only in a spiritual sense. It was to be written upon our hearts. The Jews kept the form of the law, while they were a cruel, wicked, and vindictive people.”*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.41*

It is evident that our correspondent has in mind the law of ten commandments when she speaks of the law of Moses being emblematic. We have no fault to find with the expression “law of Moses” with reference to the moral law, for it is sometimes so used in the Bible, although that title is not distinctive. As to its being emblematic, the writer herself furnishes proof that it was not, by saying that Christ gave the same law. A thing cannot be emblematic of itself; but it is true that the law that Christ taught in the sermon on the mount is the same law that the Jews were taught, and it is also true that Christ was the author of it in the beginning.*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.42*

The idea of the writer is evidently, as shown by the last expression, “The Jews kept the form of the law,” that the Jews had simply an

outward religion, while Christ taught spirituality; that the Jews had the form of the law, while Christ taught the same law in reality. But Christ in his sermon on the mount did not give anything new concerning the commandments, not even concerning the sixth and seventh. He did not teach whereas they had been informed that it was wrong to kill, he would not give them another and better commandment. Not by any means. He simply showed those people who had lost sight of the true religion that the sixth commandment does not simply forbid the taking of human life, but it forbids evil thoughts. This it did from the beginning. When the commandment was spoken from Sinai, it comprehended just as much as it does to-day. So with the whole law. Paul says in *Romans 7:14* that "the law is spiritual." This is true of the whole law, and was true of the whole law from the beginning. The law was never satisfied with anything short of spirituality. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.43*

Now it is true that many of the Jews, perhaps the majority, kept the law only in appearance. But that does not prove that there were some among the people in that day who knew the extent and depth of the law, and that it required spiritual obedience, any more than the same thing is proved by the fact that the great majority of the people in these days have only an outward morality which is not real godliness. God makes no greater demand upon us than he did upon his people anciently. It is no more true now than it was in the days of Moses that love is the fulfilling of the law; neither is it any more true to-day than then that God designed that the law should be enshrined in the heart to be the spring of every act and thought. This is shown by the following scripture:-*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.44*

In *Deuteronomy 6:5*, 6 Moses addressed the people on behalf of God as follows: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart." In *Deuteronomy 20:6* Moses says: "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and that thou mayest live." The psalmist David in all his writings shows a clear perception of the spirituality of the law, and the extent of its requirements. In *Psalms 37:31* he speaks thus of the righteous man:

“The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide;” and in the eleventh verse of the one hundred and nineteenth psalm he says, “Thy word have I his in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee.” *SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.45*

Many other texts might be cited to show that heart religion,-that is, a religion not of form, but of fact; a religion taking hold of the very life and character, and every thought,-was known to the conscientious Jews to be what God required, and that there were those who had experience in just such religion. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.46*

Again, our friend says that “while they kept the law it was imputed to them for righteousness.” This is a slight mistake. Moses, in *Deuteronomy 7:20*, says, “It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.” If they kept the law, that was their righteousness. But imputed righteousness is a different thing. The Scripture says that “Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” That is, the righteousness of God was counted to Abraham as his own, because he had faith in God. This is the way in which the ancient worthies were accounted righteous. Paul, in the book of Hebrews, says that Abel by his faith obtained witness that he was righteous, that Noah became heir of the righteousness which is by faith, and, finally, that all the worthies “through faith wrought righteousness.” Righteousness was imputed to them, the same as to us, by faith in Christ. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.47*

And this is the meaning of Paul’s language in *Romans 10:4*, which our friend quoted, that “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” The law is so pure, its standard so high, its requirements so great, that no man has the power to fulfill it; but Christ has the law dwelling in him in that he is the author of it. It proceeds from him; he is righteousness; he is the truth and the way; and to those who have implicit faith in him, he becomes righteousness and truth. In other words, men can obtain in Christ, through faith, the very same righteousness which the law requires, but which, because of the weakness of their flesh, they cannot derive from the law itself. The Author of the law, in whom grace as well as truth dwells, can impart to them the righteousness

which the law demands; and thus the object of the law is obtained, namely, the formation of a perfect character, and finally the inheritance of everlasting life, to which the law was ordained. See *Romans 7:10*. The reason why so many of the Jews failed to obtain righteousness was because they failed to seek it by faith. The "obedience of faith" is the only obedience that God could accept since the fall of Adam. E. J. W. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.48*

**"The Puritan Idea" The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson's address on "Sunday Newspapers," which has been circulated widely as a campaign document by the abettors of religious legislation, occurred the words, "Oh, for a breath of the old Puritan," meaning that what the speaker wanted was a return to Puritan habits and customs. In the recent annual meeting of the Iowa Sabbath Convention, Mr. Gault said that what was wanted in laws was a wave of Puritanism. From these and other expressions we learn that the Puritan idea of government is the model for National Reformers of whatever stripe. A few quotations from a standard work may enable those who are interested to know just what kind of government a Puritan government would be. In a late work by Professor Fisk of Harvard College, entitled, "The Beginnings of New England," is the following in connection with the account of the exodus of the Puritans from Holland:-*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.49*

"All persons who came to Holland and led decorous lives there, were protected in their opinions and customs. By contemporary writers in other countries this eccentric behavior of the Dutch Government was treated with unspeakable scorn. All strange religions flock thither,' says one; 'It is a common harbor of all heresies, a cage of unclean birds,' says another; 'The great mangle-mangle of all religion,' says a third. In spite of the relief from persecution, however, the Pilgrims were not fully satisfied with their new home. The expiration of the truce with Spain might prove that this relief was only temporary, and, at any rate, complete toleration did not fill the measure of their wants. Had they come to Holland as scattered bands of refugees, they might have been absorbed into

the Dutch population, as Huguenot refugees have been absorbed in Germany, England, and America. But they had come as an organized community, and absorption into a foreign nation was something to be dreaded. They wished to preserve their English speech and English traditions, keep up their organization, and find some favored spot where they could lay the corner-stone of a great Christian State.”*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.50*

This language is not written in any spirit of captious criticism. The author manifests a spirit of fairness, and writes in an impartial manner, simply giving historical facts. That he did not charge the Puritans with inconsistency is seen from the following, which very clearly sets forth the Puritan idea:-*SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.51*

“It is worth while to inquire what were the real aims of the settlers of New England. What was the common purpose which brought these men together in their resolve to create for themselves a new home in the wilderness? This is a point concerning which there has been a great deal of popular misapprehension, and there has been no end of nonsense talked about it. It has been customary first to assume that the Puritan migration was undertaken in the interests of religious liberty, and then to upbraid the Puritans for forgetting all about religious liberty as soon as people came among them who disagreed with their opinions. But this view of the case is not supported by history. It is quite true that the Puritans were chargeable with gross intolerance, but it is not true that in this they were guilty of inconsistency. The notion that they came to New England for the purpose of establishing religious liberty, in any sense in which we should understand such a phrase, is entirely incorrect. It is neither more nor less than a bit of popular legend. If we mean by the phrase ‘religious liberty’ a state of things in which opposite or contradictory opinions on questions of religion shall exist side by side in the same community, and in which everybody shall decide for himself how far he will conform to the customary religious observances, nothing could have been farther from their thoughts. There is nothing they would have regarded with more genuine abhorrence. If they could have been forewarned by a prophetic voice of the general freedom-or, as they would have termed it, license-of thought and behavior which prevails in this



country to-day, they would very likely have abandoned their enterprise in despair. The philosophic student of history often has occasion to see how God is wiser than man. In other words, he is often brought to realize how fortunate it is that the leaders in great historic events cannot foresee the remote results of the labors to which they have zealously consecrated their lives. It is part of the irony of human destiny that the end we really accomplish by striving with might and main is apt to be something quite different from the end we dreamed of as we started on our arduous labor. It was so with the Puritan settlers of New England. The religious liberty that we enjoy to-day is largely the consequence of their work, but it is a consequence that was unforeseen, while the direct and conscious aim of their labors was something that has never been realized, and probably never will be. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 43.52*

“The aim of Winthrop and his friends in coming to Massachusetts was a construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians, under the New Testament dispensation, all that the theocracy of Moses and Joshua and Saul had been to the Jews in Old Testament days. They should be to all intents and purposes freed from the jurisdiction of the Stuart king, and so far as possible the texts of the Holy Scriptures should be their guide, both in weighty matters of general legislation, and in the shaping of the smallest details of daily life. In such a scheme there was no room for religious liberty, as we understand it. No doubt the text of the Scriptures may be interpreted in many ways, but among those men there was a substantial agreement as to the important points, and nothing could have been farther from their thoughts than to found a colony which should afford a field for new experiments in the art of right living. The State they were to found was to consist of a united body of believers; citizenship itself was to be co-extensive with church membership; and in such a State there was apparently no more room for heretics than there was in Rome or Madrid. This was the idea which drew Winthrop and his followers from England at a time when-as events were soon to show-they might have staid there and defied persecution with less trouble than it cost them to cross the ocean and found a new State.” *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.1*

The Puritans simply followed the customs of their time. Religious

liberty was a thing unknown. Roman Catholicism and intolerance have been synonymous from the beginning. The Church of England was as intolerant as the Roman Church. The Puritans had not advanced far enough to perceive the error of the principle of religious intolerance, only they did not want the intolerance extended to them. They did not think that the Church of England ought to be intolerant, because they could see her errors, but, feeling sure that they themselves were right, they were equally sure that their opinions ought to prevail, and ought to be imposed upon others. In all New England, in the days of the Puritans, there was only one man who was far enough ahead to perceive that religion was a matter that rests with the individual, and not with the civil government, and that man was Roger Williams.*SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.2*

Although the Puritans were intolerant, and persecuted others even as they themselves were persecuted, they are not to be stigmatized as bad men. They thought they were right. They were but little removed from the darkest period of Roman superstition and oppression, and they had before them no example of perfect religious freedom. In consideration of their circumstances we can make allowance for the ideas of government which they had, and honor them for that spirit of independence which was perpetuated in their children, and which resulted in the complete religious liberty which was finally established in this country. But while we may make allowance for those men, considering their time, what allowance can be made for men who have before them the history of one hundred years of religious liberty in the United States, and who can compare its glorious work with the work of the religious despotism of the Old World. Those who in this age would institute the Puritan idea of government, must be either deplorably blind or else wickedly selfish. E. J. W.*SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.3*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:8-14” The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 20, February 15, 1890.)**

1. What did the first covenant have connected with it?*SITI February*

3, 1890, page 71.4

2. Who performed the service in the worldly sanctuary? *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.5*

3. How often was service performed in each apartment? *Hebrews 9:6, 7.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.6*

4. What was signified by this? *Verse 8.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.7*

5. What was that sanctuary? Verse 9, first part. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.8*

6. How much was accomplished by the service? *-Ib.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.9*

7. Who is our real high priest? *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.10*

8. Where does he minister? *Hebrews 8:1, 2; 9:11.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.11*

9. Is it necessary that he offer something? *Hebrews 8:3.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.12*

10. What does he offer? *Hebrews 9:12.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.13*

11. What does his blood do for us? *Verses 13, 14.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.14*

12. With what are we redeemed? *1 Peter 1:18, 19.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.15*

13. What is the blood of Christ called? *Hebrews 13:20.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.16*

14. Did Christ minister as a priest while he was on earth? *Hebrews 8:4; 9:8.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.17*

15. When did the first sanctuary cease to stand as a sanctuary? *Matthew 23:38; 27:50, 51.SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.18*

16. What secured the pardon of transgressions that were committed under the first covenant? *Hebrews 9:14, 15. SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.19*

17. Since Christ did not begin his priestly work of offering his own blood until after the crucifixion and ascension, how could this be? *Galatians 3:17; Hebrews 6:13-18. SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.20*

#### NOTE

The ordinances of divine service that were connected with the first covenant had no efficacy whatever. They could not make the comer thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience. All transgressions committed under that covenant that were pardoned, were pardoned by virtue of the second covenant, of which Christ is Mediator. Yet although Christ's blood was not shed until hundreds of years after the first covenant was made, sins were forgiven whenever they were confessed. That covenant, as we have seen, was for the purpose of directing the minds of the people to the Abrahamic covenant, which God confirmed in Christ. *Galatians 3:17*. This confirmation was by an oath, in addition to the promise. These "two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie," made the sacrifice of Christ as efficacious in the days of Abraham and Moses as it is now. This is made still more evident by the statement that these two things given to Abraham are the things which give us strong consolation. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.21*

**"What the Gospel Teaches" The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And he said unto him, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." *Mark 16:15, 16*. These words were spoken by our Saviour after his resurrection, and shortly before his ascension. They are perfectly in harmony with his words recorded in *Matthew 24:14*, that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." There is no mistaking the extent of territory in which the gospel

must be preached-nothing less than the whole world. And how long must it be preached? Read the whole of *Matthew 24:14*: “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.” Then the gospel is to be preached until the end. The end here referred to is the same that is mentioned in *verse 3*, “The end of the world.” That this “end of the world” is in connection with the coming of the Lord, is shown by the words of the disciples in the verse last mentioned, and by the words of Christ in *Matthew 13:40-43; 24:30, 31*. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.22*

The fact that by divine command the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, proves conclusively that until the Lord comes, a necessity for its being preached will exist in all the world. This needs no further argument, for it is nowhere disputed. We will therefore turn our attention to a consideration of what the gospel is, and what creates the necessity for its being so long and so extensively preached. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.23*

The word “gospel” means, literally, “a good message;” Webster’s first definition is “glad tidings.” According to its derivation, it might be applied to any good news; but in the Bible it is used with exclusive reference to one thing; what that thing is, we may easily learn from the Bible itself. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.24*

In *Luke 2:10* we find these words, addressed by the angel of the Lord to the shepherds in the field: “Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings [a gospel] of great joy, which shall be to all people.” The next verse tells what this gospel is: “For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.” Then the gospel which is to be preached to all people is the announcement of a Saviour. It is from this that Webster derives his specific definition of the gospel, as, “especially, the good news concerning Christ and his salvation.” *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.25*

But the simple heralding of Christ, without stating the nature and object of his work, would not be the preaching of the gospel. The “good news” consists in the fact that Christ the Lord is a *Saviour*.

That Christ comes as a Saviour, necessarily implies that there are people to be saved, and something from which they must be saved. Turning to *Matthew 1:21*, we read the angel's declaration before the birth of Christ: "And thou shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." Paul says (*1 Timothy 1:15*): "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." So it is manifest that the preaching of the gospel consists in the announcement that Christ will save people from sin. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.26*

But while the gospel is the good news that Christ brings salvation from sin, it is evident that that simple announcement would not suffice to produce the desired results, viz., that men should believe and be baptized. For there are millions of people who virtually say that they are "rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," not knowing that they are "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." No matter how destitute a man may be, it would be of no use to offer him money if he were ignorant of his necessities, and perfectly satisfied with his condition. So no man can feel any interest in the gospel as a means of salvation from sin, unless he (1) knows what sin is, and (2) is convinced that he is a sinner, and (3) understands the nature and results of sin, so as to realize that it is something to be shunned. Therefore the gospel, with its announcement of salvation from sin, must also make known what sin is. This it does, as we shall see. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.27*

John, the evangelist, so called because it is he who more than anyone else dwells on the love of God and Christ in the salvation of man, defines sin. He says: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for *sin is the transgression of the law.*" *1 John 3:4*. In harmony with this, Paul says that "where no law is, there is no transgression." *Romans 4:15*. And "sin is not imputed when there is no law." *Romans 5:12*. Volumes could not define sin more clearly than do these three texts. We have found out, then, (1) that "gospel" means good news; (2) that the gospel of the Bible is the good news of a Saviour-Christ the Lord (*Luke 2:10, 11*); (3) that Jesus saves from sin (*Matthew 1:21; 1 Timothy 1:15*); and (4) that "sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 71.28*

So that, in short, the gospel announces the way by which man may be saved from the transgression of the law, and from the consequences of such transgression. Sin is the disease; the gospel is the remedy. And since the gospel is to be preached in all the world, until the coming of the Lord, it follows that “all the world,” yea, “every creature,” has sinned. This we read in *Romans 3:23*: “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” *SITI February 3, 1890, page 82.1*

It must also be true that sin will be in the world till the Lord comes. And this we verify by a comparison of *Genesis 6:5* and *13:13* with *Luke 17:26-30*. But since sin is the transgression of the law, it also necessarily follows that “the law” will be in full force in all the world until the coming of the Lord. In other words, sin is the disease, and it cannot exist where there is no law. *Romans 4:15*. The disease, sin, does exist in “every creature” in “all the world;” for the remedy, the gospel, is to be thus extensively made known, and the great Physician would not send the remedy where it is not needed. “They that be whole need not a physician; but they that are sick” (*Matthew 9:12*); and therefore the law, by which alone “is the knowledge of sin”-the disease-is binding upon “every creature” “in all the world.” Now since “the wages of sin”-the transgression of the law-“is death” (*Romans 6:23*), it is important that all men know just what that law is, the transgression of which brings death, and just what its nature and requirements. These points will therefore next claim our attention. *SITI February 3, 1890, page 82.2*

## February 10, 1890

**“A Sunday Law for the District of Columbia”** The Signs of the Times, 16, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

On the 6th of January, Mr. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, introduced into the House of Representatives a bill which is entitled, “A Bill to Prevent Persons from Being Forced to Labor on Sunday,” which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It reads as follows:-*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.3*

“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in congress assembled, that it shall be unlawful for any person, or corporation, or employe of any person or corporation, in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act.*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.4*

“Any person or corporation, or employe of any person or corporation, in the District of Columbia, who shall violate the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 for every such offense; *provided, however,* that the provisions of this act shall not be considered to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.”*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.5*

The bill is misleading in its nature. To give the proposed law the appearance of moderation and benevolence, it is entitled, “A Bill to Prevent Persons from Being Forced to Labor on Sunday.” If that were really what the framers of that bill are exercised over, they might save their labor; for there is no more necessity for a law to prevent people from being forced to labor on Sunday, than there is for a law to prevent them from being forced to wear woolen clothes in the summer-time. If a person wishes to wear woolen in the summer-time, he has the privilege. If he prefers cotton or linen, he



can wear that. So, if people wish to labor on Sunday, they usually do; and if they don't want to, there is no power that can compel them to. For section one of the thirteenth amendment to the constitution says that-*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.6*

“Neither slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.7*

The title of the bill would imply that there are some people in the United States who are compelled to labor on Sunday against their will. If there are any such, they should demand the right which the Constitution of the United States guarantees to them.*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.8*

It is a fact that a great many people in the United States labor on Sunday; and it is also a fact that those who labor on that day do so because they do not regard the day as sacred. If they did not labor they would spend the day in amusement. That the bill does not mean what its title says, is further shown by the very first clause, namely, that it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, etc., to perform any labor or business. Anyone would naturally suppose that a capitalist or company of capitalists would not be in a position to be forced to labor by anybody. They can labor or not as they choose. And when they labor on Sunday it is because they choose to, and not because they are forced to. Therefore when the bill says that it shall be unlawful for anybody to perform labor on Sunday, it contradicts its title, which says that its purpose is to prevent people from being *forced* to labor on that day.*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.9*

Again, why is the adjective “secular” used before “labor or business”? Why is it that only secular labor or business is to be forbidden on Sunday? *Secular* is the opposite of *religious*; and the reason why secular labor is specified is that Sunday is regarded as a sacred or religious day, upon which it is by many considered wicked to perform secular labor. Therefore the bill spears on the face of it to be in the line of religious legislation.*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.10*

The fact that this is simply a piece of religious legislation is further shown by the exemption at the close of the bill, where it is provided that the act “shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday, as a day of rest.” Civil government has nothing whatever to do with the conscience of men. But this bill takes into account conscientious convictions. It is a bill for the purpose of compelling everybody to conscientiously observe some day of the week as a day of rest, or, if some have no conscience in the matter, to compel them to act as though they had. *SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.11*

So far as the exemption is concerned, it amounts to nothing. If the bill should become a law, the condition of things would be the same as it is now; for since the world stood, nobody ever heard of a Sunday law being enforced, when it had an exemption clause. If it is determined to compel people to observe Sunday, the clause must be left out. If the exemption is retained, and the bill passes, it will be a nullity. In showing the inconsistency of this bill, we make no reflection on the honorable member who drew it up. He doubtless did the best he could with a bad job. The statesman never yet lived who was wise enough to frame a Sunday law which should be consistent with itself and with civil rights. E. J. W. *SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.12*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:15-20” The Signs of the Times, 16, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 21, February 22, 1890.)**

1. What was effected by the blood of the old covenant? *SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.13*

2. Was any sin ever removed by that covenant? *SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.14*

3. What can the blood of Christ accomplish? *SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.15*

4. What provision is made for transgressors under the first

covenant? *Hebrews 9:13.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.16*

5. What law did they transgress under the first covenant?*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.17*

6. Then if Jesus is Mediator for their transgressions, in behalf of what law is he the Mediator?*SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.18*

7. By what means did he become their Redeemer? *Verse 15.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.19*

8. Who are meant by them which are called? Ans.-All, of all ages and nations, to whom the word of salvation comes, or whom the Spirit of God moves to accept the word. See *Acts 2:39.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.20*

9. What may they receive through the priesthood of Christ? *Hebrews 9:15. See note.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.21*

10. What is necessary where there is a testament? *Verse 16.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.22*

11. Why is this the case? *Verse 17.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.23*

12. How was the old covenant ratified? *Verse 18.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.24*

13. What did Moses speak to the people? *Verse 19.SITI February 10, 1890, page 82.25*

14. Where is this transaction recorded? *Exodus 24:3-5.SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.1*

15. What did Moses send young men to do? *Verse 5.SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.2*

16. Of what did their burnt-offerings consist? Compare *Hebrews 9:18.SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.3*

17. What did Moses do with the blood?-*ib.*, *Exodus 24:6, 8.SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.4*

18. With what did he sprinkle the blood?*SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.5*

#### NOTES

*Verse 15* has a fund of instruction underlying the first glance at the language. It is made very sure that Jesus is the Mediator between the people who lived under the first covenant, and the law which God proclaimed to them, of which they were transgressors. And it is absurd to suppose that God will judge the family of Adam, moral agents, by different moral standards. It is the law given to the Jews, which David says is perfect, that it is righteousness, etc. It is the same law that Solomon says contains the whole duty of man, and by which God will bring every work into judgment. The commandments given to Israel in the wilderness are the lively oracles which Stephen said they received to give unto us. *Acts 7:38. SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.6*

I n *verse 15* is again introduced the contrast which was so successfully argued in *chapter 4*. Though the children of Israel rejoiced that they had had rest from their wanderings, and that the Lord had subdued their enemies before them, and given them homes for themselves and their children, they were yet subject to cares, to sickness, pain, and death. Joshua gave them a temporal rest. But a greater than Joshua had become the leader of his people, and the rest that remains is an eternal inheritance. And God is so wise and merciful in the provisions of his grace that the faithful even under the first covenant may share their inheritance. *SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.7*

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE

The primitive signification of *diatheke*, the Greek word translated "covenant," is "will," or "testament." It comes from a word which signifies to put, set, make, to dispose of. Covenant, in the sense generally understood, that of "contract or agreement," is only a derived meaning. The new covenant is the will and testament of our God, conveying, by as solemn ratification as the death of Christ could make it, what God bequeaths to his children. These things he

had promised in the beginning; these promises he had repeated from time to time; but when Christ came the covenant, or the bequeathed blessings, were brought together into the last testament of him who was heir of all, and who gave his life for the world. Voluntarily he died to prove the strength of the promises which God made to his people, and of the great love of God for them. It had ever been sure in the purpose of God, but when Christ died, angels and men could doubt no longer. *SITI February 10, 1890, page 91.8*

## February 17, 1890

“Sunday-Law Petitions” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

We have just received the American Sabbath Union’s *Monthly Document*, No. 13, bearing date of December, 1889, the last page of which contains a copy of the new petition, which is being circulated in behalf of the national Sunday law. The following is a copy of the petition to be presented to the United States Senate, a duplicate being furnished for presentation to the House of Representatives:-*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.9*

*Petitions Gather by the... Sabbath Association. SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.10*

For a Sunday Re T Law.

The petition which follows was endorsed by a standing vote of.... to...(men and women of 21 years of age or more) by a meeting of citizens of the State (or Territory) of...County of...City (or Town) of...on ....*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.11*

Attest.... Presiding*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.12*

The petition which follows was endorsed at regularly called meetings by the following churches, labor societies, temperance unions, and other organizations of the above-named locality: ...Church...members, by vote of...to...Attest: .... Church...members, by vote of...to Attest: ...*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.13*

*To the United States Senate: SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.14*

The above organizations and undersigned adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the place aforesaid, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill, forbidding, to the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the

week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.15*

[Individual signatures to their own handwriting, preceded by Mr. or Mrs., or Miss. Add more paper for individual signatures.]*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.16*

There can be no question but that, in a certain sense at least, there is no attempt to deceive in this petition. It is about as bold an attempt to perpetrate a fraud as was ever conceived. It is presumed that petitions represent the will of the petitioners; but here is a deliberate plan to represent people as petitioning who have never expressed an opinion. The securing of the individual signatures is a secondary matter. If they are secured, more paper must be added; but on the petition paper there is no provision made for this. Wholesale representative indorsement is all that is planned for.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.17*

The reader will notice that the only chance for definiteness of statement in filling out the petition is the number of persons belonging to the church or organization voting. The number of people voting is left indefinite. For instance, if the matter were presented at a meeting of an organization containing 300 members, a part of whom were present, and a portion only of those present voting, the petition would be filled out, stating that the petition which followed was indorsed at a regularly-called meetings of the Blanktown Methodist Church, 300 members, by vote of 125 to 175. Which one of these numbers would be taken as representing the number of petitioners?-Of course it would be the largest number. They would not take the smallest, and they could not use the next larger, as that would not be definite; and so, following the old custom, where there is a doubt, they will count everything and thus be sure to have enough. Of course the exact number voting in any meeting might be ascertained by a simple count, but that would take too long; and the number of petitioners could not be increased so rapidly as by this method.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.18*

It is evident from the framing of the petition that it is not designed in any instance that the number of voters shall be counted. Only a few

moments ago a friend was telling about a Sunday-law meeting which he attended in Milwaukee, which was conducted by Mr. Crafts. At the close those who favored the petition were requested to rise. Then Mr. Crafts said that they would not take time to count those who voted, as it was somewhat late, but that the pastor knew the number of sittings in the church, and he could fill out the petition. Since this is the way the work of securing petitioners for a Sunday law is carried on, we cannot see why they go through the formality of taking a vote; for it is not individual influence that is represented, but church pews.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.19*

We commend this work to the careful consideration of all who think that the passing of a Sunday law would be a righteous act. If Sunday laws are righteous, how is it that so much iniquity and deceit are indulged in to secure them? Do these people believe in doing evil that good may come? If they do, let them be warned by *Romans 3:8*. E. J. W.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.20*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:20-23” The Signs of the Times, 16, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 22, February 22, 1890.)**

1. Who spoke to Israel in behalf of the Lord when the first covenant was made?*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.21*

2. What did he do with the blood?*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.22*

3. What did he then say? *Exodus 24:8; Hebrews 9:20.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.23*

4. Is there any difference in these texts? Ans.-The first says, made; the second, enjoined. The Hebrew word used has a number of significations. The conditions of the covenant were not arranged between the parties, but were matters enjoined.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.24*

5. What similar language did Jesus use in establishing the new covenant? *Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24.SITI February 17, 1890,*



*page 91.25*

6. What more did Moses sprinkle with blood? *Hebrews 9:21.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.26*

7. In the typical law, were all things purified by blood? *Verse 22.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.27*

8. What was the nature of the exceptions? See *Numbers 19*. See note.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.28*

9. What is necessary to the remission of sin? *Hebrews 9:22.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.29*

10. Why was the blood chosen to make atonement? *Leviticus 17:11.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.30*

11. What is meant in *Genesis 9:6* by the words, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood"? Ans.-As the life is in the blood, it is equivalent to saying, Whoso taketh man's life.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.31*

12. What should be the fate of him who sheds the blood of man? *Genesis 9:6.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.32*

13. What does this teach? Ans.-That only blood, or life, can atone for life.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.33*

14. Whose lives are forfeited to the law? See *Romans 3:19, 23; 6:23.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.34*

15. Must we still depend upon blood to be cleared before the law? 1 *John 1:7; Ephesians 1:7.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.35*

16. What was necessary in the earthly sanctuary? *Hebrews 9:23.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.36*

17. Were the earthly holy places purified by the blood of bulls and goats? *Leviticus 16:14, 15, 19.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.37*

18. What are the earthly things called? *Hebrews 9:23.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.38*

19. Do the heavenly things need purifying? -*lb.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.39*

20. How did the patterns become defiled? See note.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.40*

21. Who takes away our sins? *John 1:29.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.41*

22. Why did Christ take our sins upon himself? Ans.-Because he is our High Priest; the priest bears the judgment of the people. *Exodus 28:29, 30.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.42*

23. Where is he filling his priestly office? See *Hebrews 8:1, 2.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.43*

24. Are the heavenly things defiled by our sins going to our priest?*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.44*

25. With what is it necessary for the heavenly things to be cleansed? *Hebrews 9:23.SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.45*

#### NOTES

Here again in *verse 21* is a statement of that which we do not find in the writings of Moses. But we learn that the Jews had a tradition that such was the case, and in this instance their tradition must have been correct. In the account of the erection of the tabernacle, and the dedication of the holy things, it is recorded that they were anointed with oil, but the sprinkling of blood is not mentioned. This, however, does not involve any contradiction.*SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.46*

The fact that some things, and in some cases persons, were purified without blood, see *Numbers 19*, does not disagree with the reasonable statement that without shedding of blood is no remission; for, in cases of purification with oil, or water, there was no sin. There were misfortunes, as in certain sicknesses, or accidents, fleshly defilements. But the wages of sin is death, always, and where the penalty is death nothing but life can meet the demand of the law. Now as the blood is the life of man

(*Deuteronomy 12:23*), it is given to make atonement. *Leviticus 17:11*. The offering of blood for life signifies life for life. Hence the statement that we have redemption through the blood of Christ. It means that our lives are purchased with his life, God's appointments are in strict accord with reason and justice. *SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.47*

No objection against the true doctrine of the atonement is more persistently urged than this, that there can be nothing in heaven that needs cleansing. Such pleading for heaven reminds us of the zeal of Peter in vindicating his Lord. *Matthew 16:21-23*. But to prove that the heavenly sanctuary does need cleansing because of our sins taken by our Priest, and that nothing but the blood of Christ can cleanse it, is the whole drift of the apostle's argument. Take away this great truth, and his labored argument would be without any logical conclusion. Not only were the earthly sacrifices typical of Christ's sacrifice, and the earthly priests typical of his priesthood, but the earthly sanctuary was typical of the heavenly holy places. And of course the cleansing of the sanctuary on earth with the blood of bulls and goats was typical of the purifying of the heavenly things with better sacrifice. In the whole argument of this remarkable letter, nothing is made more plain than this. *SITI February 17, 1890, page 91.48*

**February 24, 1890**

**“A Movement to Unite Church and State” The Signs of the Times, 16, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of January 6, there appeared the text of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, “respecting establishments of religion in free public schools.” This, as was then stated, is but the repetition, in slightly modified form, of the resolution proposed by Senator Blair at the last Congress. The resolution is contradictory, in that, while it says that no “State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” it provides that “each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the instruction of all the children living therein, between the ages of six to sixteen years inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in the knowledge of the fundamental and nonsectarian principles of Christianity.” That is, while it professes to be constitutional, and to be opposed to any State establishment of religion, its whole intent is to provide for that very thing. For we shall show that for the States to establish schools for the purpose of teaching the principles of Christianity, would be to unite Church and State. *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.49*

The resolution calls for the instruction of children in the “fundamental and nonsectarian principles of Christianity.” Now what are the fundamental principles of Christianity? It is self-evident that Christianity pertains to Christ, and that nothing can be taught in regard to Christianity without teaching Christ. Where do we learn about Christ? and what shall we teach about him? We learn of Christ in the Bible, and nowhere else. All we know of Christ is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, and therefore that which is taught of Christ, in teaching the fundamental principles of Christianity, must be what the Bible reveals concerning him. So the very first thing in teaching Christianity is the consideration of who Christ is. And what about him? What does he do for us? What is the nature of his work? The simple answer to these points, according to the Bible, would be that Christ is the Son

of God; the divine word who was in the beginning with God, by whom all things were created; who was made flesh and dwelt among men; who died and rose again to redeem men and to save them from sin. And this brings up the fact that men have sinned against God; they have broken his law. And so, to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity is to teach the law of God, which points out sin, and to teach Christ as the Saviour from sin; to teach his power and majesty as the one who is able to save from sin; in short, the fundamental principles of Christianity are all there is of it. You cannot teach anything about Christianity without teaching these very things. For Christianity may be summed up in a word as the way of salvation from sin, through Christ.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.50*

Suppose now the State enters upon the work of giving this instruction to all children within its borders. What is it doing?-It is doing the very work for which the church of Christ exists. Christ instituted a church here upon earth that it might be the light of the world, that it might spread abroad in the earth a knowledge of him and of his truth. That is all the church is for. Now when we have the entire government doing this work in every school district, we have simply the State organizing itself into a universal church. That would be a State Church, a union of Church and State. Nothing less than this can be made of it.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.51*

Again, the bill says "the fundamental and *non-sectarian* principles of Christianity." By that is meant those principles which are not peculiar to any sect, but which all denominations can unite upon. Please consider the fundamental principles of Christianity, as we have referred to them, and see upon which one of them all denominations are agreed. Christianity means the doctrine of Christ. Who is Christ? Some say he is the divine Son of God, and others deny this. Some say that his work was vicarious, others that he simply lived and died as an example. There has been disagreement upon the very first principles of Christianity ever since the church existed. So that if the public schools are to teach the principles of Christianity, they must teach principles that are held by some denominations and disbelieved by others.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.52*

In his book, "Romanism versus the Public-School System," page 170, Dr. Daniel Dorchester says:-*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.53*

"It is plain that is all classes are to use the public school, there must be no specific religious instruction. It cannot be imparted consistently with the American system of government; if religious instruction is given, it will be almost certain to savor of some particular sect." *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.54*

The same thing is put more forcibly by the Honorable Stanley Matthews, in a speech in reference to the Bible in the schools of Cincinnati. Said he:-*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.55*

"The Gentlemen on the other side say they limit the religious instruction demanded to what they call a 'broad Christianity.' I have already once or twice averted to the term. I do not know that I understand it. If I do, it is a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something or it means nothing. In my view it is a supernatural scheme of redemption-a revelation from God of his gracious purpose and plan of salvation to a race 'dead in trespasses and sins,' through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, who, being God from eternity, became incarnate for sin, made expiation for it, and, having risen from the grave, ascended into heaven, and there sitteth on the right hand of the Father to make intercession for his people. The whole character and value of such a religion consists altogether in being, as it claims to be, a supernatural plan of salvation from sin. Otherwise it is irremedial. Strike out from the Bible the parts which disclose, reveal, and teach that scheme, and the rest is insignificant. And any instruction or education in religion which does not teach the facts which constitute that scheme, and which cannot be stated even, except as conveying dogma, is no instruction in the Christian religion whatever." *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.56*

This is the truth clearly and forcibly stated. If the principles of Christianity are to be taught at all, the whole must be taught. Christianity is a unit, and the whole of it is contained in the fundamental principles. If the State is going into the business of teaching this, then we ask, How will the work of the school-teacher

differ from that of the Sunday-school teacher and the minister of the gospel? And the only answer is that their work will be a little more comprehensive. They will be doing the work of the minister and the Sunday-school teacher, and, together with that, will be giving instruction in the sciences. So that, as we said before, for the public schools of the United States to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity would be to establish a State Church, to effect a union of Church and State in the most complete manner possible.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.57*

We have already shown that nonsectarian instruction in religion cannot be given. Such instruction will necessarily savor of some particular sect, as Dr. Dorchester says. And this, it is admitted, would be to effect a union of Church and State. Thus, in the book before referred to, on page 65, Dr. Dorchester, in referring to an appropriation by the State of New York to certain Catholic schools, says:-*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.58*

“The people thus found themselves taxed for the support of sectarian education, the Roman Catholic faith being taught in the schools thus supported. The State and the Church were then virtually united.”*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.59*

It is plainly evident that whatever way we consider this proposed amendment, it is really an amendment to effect a union of Church and State. We have not in this article touched upon some of the pernicious results that would necessarily grow out of the adoption of the amendment, except as the readers may infer for themselves some of the evils that would result from a Church and State union. In another article we shall show some of the wickedness that would follow its adoption. E. J. W.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.60*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:24-28” The Signs of the Times, 16, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 23, March 8, 1890.)**

1. With what were the earthly holies purified?*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.61*

2. Whose office was it to cleanse the sanctuary?*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.62*
3. Do the heavenly things need cleansing?*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.63*
4. Where has our High Priest entered?*Hebrews 9:24.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.64*
5. Why could not Christ act as priest in the earthly sanctuary?*Chap. 8:4.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.65*
6. If the earthly was the pattern of the heavenly, must there not be two holy places in the heavenly? *Hebrews 9:23, 24.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.66*
7. What does the word “true” mean in *verse 24*? Ans.-The true holy places-holy places understood.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.67*
8. Where are the true holy places? *Verse 24.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.68*
9. How often did the high priest enter the most holy on earth? *Verse 25.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.69*
10. How often does Christ enter the heavenly sanctuary for us? -*lb. See Verse 12.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.70*
11. What is meant by the end of the world, *verse 26*? Ans.-The last dispensation.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.71*
12. For what hath Christ appeared? -*lb.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.72*
13. Whose sins did he come to put away? Compare *chap. 7:25.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.73*
14. Whose sins does he put away? Ans.-Only those who cease to sin. They who continue to transgress the law of God never have their sins put away; they retain them. *Matthew 7:21.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.74*



15. How did he accomplish this work? *Hebrews 9:26.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.75*

16. What is appointed to all men? *Verse 27.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.76*

17. What comes after death?-*lb.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.77*

18. What is implied by introducing the judgment as following death? Ans.-That the judgment is consequent upon this life, and for one probation only.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.78*

19. What analogy is shown between our probation and the death of Christ? Ans.-As we die one, living but one life, having but one probation, so Christ once died to bear sins.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.79*

20. For how many did he die?-*lb. Compare chap. 2:9.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.80*

21. What is meant by the words, "He hath once appeared," *Hebrews 9:26*? Ans.-He has made one advent to this world.*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.81*

22. Will he appear again? *Verse 28.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.82*

23. How will he appear?-*lb. See note.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.83*

24. For what purpose will he appear?-*lb.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.84*

25. To whom will he appear unto salvation?-*lb. See 2 Timothy 4:1, 8.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.85*

26. How will he appear to those who do not look for him, nor love his appearing? *2 Thessalonians 1:6-8; Revelation 6:15-17.SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.86*

## NOTE

It is to be regretted that commentators have so generally overlooked the true intent of *Hebrews 9:28*, and construed it to mean “without a sin-offering.” The original word occurs seventy-three times in the New Testament, and is rendered “sinful,” once; “offense,” once; “sin,” seventy-one times. It is never claimed that it can bear the sense of sin-offering in the New Testament, except in *2 Corinthians 5:21*, and *Hebrews 9:28*. And we are very confident that it does not in either of these texts. In *2 Corinthians 5:21* the contrast and the force are measurably lost by so rendering it. “He hath made him to be sin for us, who himself knew no sin.” Our iniquity was laid upon him; he was bruised for our sakes-in our stead. He bore our sin, and suffered as if he had actually been the sinner. The Scripture doctrine of substitution is entirely too strong and clear to admit of this text being changed into sin-offering. In *Hebrews 9* there is presented a series of events, mostly in contrast with the things of the earthly service, each of which occurs without being repeated. He offered one sacrifice; he offered it but once; he entered once into the heavenly sanctuary. Man dies once (therefore there is but one probationary life); and after this one death, the judgment. So Christ was once offered to bear sin; and he will once more (a second time) come, without sin. He was once offered to bear sin; he bore it on the cross; he bears our judgment-the iniquity of his priesthood-before the throne. As a priest he has continually taken sins, except from those who choose to retain them. But when he comes again, he will be separated from sin; he will bear sin no more. As it reads, it signifies that at his second coming his priesthood, his act of sin-bearing, is forever ended. *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.87*

The difference is evident and material. He might come without a sin-offering, he might not renew his sacrifice, and yet not make an end of his priestly service. He has made but one offering in more than 1,850 years, and his priesthood has continued all these centuries by virtue of that one offering. And it might continue indefinitely, in the same manner, by that one and the same offering. All these centuries he has been receiving the sins of penitents. But he comes without sin, separate or apart from sin, as it really means. This indicates that he will bear sin no more; that he has put it from

him. Then he that is unjust must so remain. *Revelation 22:10-12. SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.88*

The following remarks from Dr. Barnes on this text, concerning the coming again of our blessed Saviour, are interesting:-*SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.89*

“There is a propriety that he should thus return. He came once to be humbled, despised, and put to death; and there is a fitness that he should come to be honored in his own world. *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.90*

“Every person on earth is interested in the fact that he will return, for ‘every eye shall see him.’ *Revelation 1:7*. All who are now in their graves, all who now live, and all who will hereafter live, will behold the Redeemer in his glory. *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.91*

“It will not be merely to gaze upon him, and to admire his magnificence, that they will see him. It will be for greater and more momentous purposes-with reference to an eternal doom. *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.92*

“The great mass of men are not prepared to meet him. They do not believe that he will return; they do not desire that he should appear; they are not ready for the solemn interview which they will have with him. His appearing now would overwhelm them with surprise and horror. There is nothing in the future which they less expect and desire than the second coming of the Son of God, and in the present state of the world his appearance would produce almost universal consternation and despair. It would be like the coming of the flood of waters on the old world; like the sheets of flame on Sodom and Gomorrah.” *SITI February 24, 1890, page 91.93*

## March 3, 1890

“Good Words in a Sunday Convention” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

In previous numbers of the SIGNS we have shown the fallacy of the idea the civil government may enforce any portion of the moral law, and we have also shown the evil consequences which would necessarily result from an attempt to put such a fallacious idea into practice. We are glad to present in this number a corroboration of our views by a minister of the gospel. And we are the more glad because the argument which we shall quote was made in a Sunday convention, in the second annual meeting of the Sabbath Association of Iowa, which was held in Des Moines, November 12, and 13, 1889. Rev. J. K. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, gave an address on “The Basis of the Civil Sabbath,” which was printed in full in the *Iowa State Register* of November 13, from which we quote. Speaking of the laws already existing, and of the Sunday laws which the association is seeking to make, he said:-*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.94*

“If these laws are right, why are they right? There needs to be a clearing up at this point. The ideas of many are vague and faulty as to the genius and intent of these Sunday regulations. Many in the church and out imagine that they prescribe a precept of the Christian religion; that they are simply a transcript of the fourth commandment to our statute-books. More than that, many ardent defenders of the Sabbath justify them on that ground. They say, God has enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, and the State should do the same. But God has demanded that we be good stewards of his bounty, and give liberally to him. Is the State therefore to command this? God has commanded that we be given to hospitality. Is the State to see to it that this be accomplished? God has commanded that we honor one another and in honor prefer one another. Shall the State undertake the enforcement of these divine laws? It is time we had done with arguing for Sabbath legislation before Congress or other legislative bodies on plea of its divine institution and scriptural authority. It is utterly untenable according to the spirit of our charters of government.”*SITI March 3,*

1890, page 91.95

In this paragraph the question is fairly stated, and the statement in the closing sentence is correct. After referring to certain judicial decisions on certain laws against crime, the speaker continued as follows:-*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.96*

“The civil law forbids these, not as offenses against God, but as crimes against man. The law has to do with the relations of men to each other, and not with the relations of men to God. To base these Sunday laws thus upon a divine command, as the civil ground, is to that extent to join Church and State, and to violate the fundamental principles of the State and federal governments.”*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.97*

In the above paragraph we have a just distinction made between sin and crime. Sin is the violation of the moral law. Crime is a violation of human law. We wish the reader to notice the latter part of the paragraph just quoted. In agreement with arguments we have before presented, he shows that for the State to base its law upon divine command, or to attempt to enforce any one of the divine commands, is the union of Church and State. This was wholesome truth to present before a Sunday convention. We wish every Sunday convention could listen to similar talk. Mr. Fowler continued as follows, concerning the idea that the State could enact a Sunday law on the basis of the divine commandment:-*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.98*

“But such a basis of the Sunday law is not only illegal, but it may be even unscriptural. The Bible itself does not warrant us in inscribing upon the civil statute-books whatever we find to be the mind of the Lord. The Bible does not give us a divine standard of moral duty, by which we may discriminate between right and wrong. But it also gives a divine model of wise legislation. It shows there are some things reasonable and some unreasonable to undertake by the civil statute, that statutory law is not to be framed always into exact correspondence with the criterion of individual duty. And this scriptural lesson is one of the very first importance for a Christian citizen of a republic like ours to learn.”*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.99*

We wish every citizen of this republic might learn this scriptural lesson. The fact that the great body of the National Reformers desire to have the State attempt to re-enact and enforce the law of God, shows, according to Rev. Mr. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, that they are very deficient in scriptural knowledge; and in this we agree with him. Again Mr. Fowler said:-*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.100*

"If our zealous, well-meaning, but deluded friends of the Sabbath, desire to defeat the very ends they aim at, they want to push to the front, and press upon the law-makers this scriptural command for the basis of Sunday laws, until a furor of public feeling like that of 1826 again sweeps the country and takes with it every vestige of Sabbath legislation. Many good people, even of these boasted days of religious liberty, fail to understand that the State is not competent to enjoin divine precepts because they are divine. The law against murder is not on the civil statute-books because it is in the decalogue, but because society could not exist without such a law. The law against stealing is not in the civil code because it was found essential to maintain the rights of property. Government exists to secure to men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to maintain a peaceful and orderly, a mutual, helpful condition of society. Hence its laws simply aim at these ends. They are passed because of some supposed public need, because it is believed the general good requires them. We are bound thus in the matter of the Sunday laws to stand outside the Bible and argue for them on the same line as all the other laws, because the public need and advantage require them. If we cannot indicate them on these grounds they can claim and deserve no place on the statute-books." *SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.101*

With this also we heartily agree; only one statement might have been made a little stronger, and that is, that laws passed to secure men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are passed on account of some supposed public need. There can be no supposition about it. If there is to be any public at all, it is an actual necessity that life and liberty be preserved. But in all these paragraphs which we have quoted the speaker has shown a clear perception of the limitations of human government, and we would that all could read his argument and see the force of it, and agree with him that, if Sunday laws are made to stand, it must be because

the public good requires them. The next and closing paragraph of this speech shows how impossible it is to make it appear that the public good requires a Sunday law, and that the Sunday should be enforced for the same reason that laws are enacted against stealing. Said he:-*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.102*

“That a law-guarded rest-day is one of these agencies will hardly be questioned by any reasonable man. On that day peace of God settles down over Sabbath-keeping land. The din of labor ceases, and the din of strife and merry-making, and a few quiet hours are given in which the most engrossed and toil-burdened soul may at least have the opportunity, if it will, to worship God and learn of truths that bear upon a right life. Remember that the law makes no attempt to enforce religion, or even religious observance, on Sunday. It simply institutes a weekly civil holiday, and surrounds it with safeguards such as subserve the interests of morality and makes as favorable as possible.”*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.103*

In this paragraph the speaker went against all he had so clearly stated before. His attempt to show that society requires such a law, by stating that on Sunday, if enforced by law, peace settles down over the land, and a few quiet hours are given in which all may have the opportunity to learn of God and truths that bear upon a right life, shows that such laws are at least an attempt to enforce morality. There is not the slightest ground on which a so-called civil Sunday law can be based consistently with justice. If it is said that man needs one day in seven for rest, then we will point to the thousands who are observing the seventh day of the week, and to the scores of thousands who are observing the first day of the week, without any law compelling rest. That is sufficient evidence that no such law is needed. If the law is asked only in order that man may have one day in the week to rest, why is it that many who have strictly and quietly rested on the seventh day have been persecuted for not resting on the first day? They have surely rested one-seventh of the time, and nobody can claim that resting upon the first day of the week will do a man more good than resting upon the seventh. Of course it will be said that the seventh day is not the day that the law recognizes; that the great body of Christians recognize the first day, and therefore the law should demand rest on that day. So then the whole question of the civil Sunday law is given up, and it is admitted

that the basis of the law is some supposed superiority of Sunday over other days.*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.104*

It needs no argument to show that all the physical good that may be gained by resting on Sunday is gained to an equal extent by resting on Saturday, and as to the good of society we challenge anyone to demonstrate that a society observing the seventh day is not outwardly, to say the least, as good as one which observes the first. But in spite of Mr. Fowler's little defection at the close of his speech, we think it is a good one, and commend it to the careful perusal of our readers. E. J. W.*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.105*

**"Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:1-9" The Signs of the Times, 16, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 24, March 15, 1890.)**

1. What was the nature of the law of sacrifices? *Hebrews 10:1.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.106*

2. Was it exactly like the things of which it was the shadow?-*lb.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.107*

3. What differences were there between the priesthood of Aaron and that of Christ?*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.108*

4. Could the sacrifices of that law make anyone perfect?-*lb.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.109*

5. If they could, what would have been the result? *Verse 2.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.110*

6. Why would they have ceased to be offered? Ans.-They would have had the same power as the offering of Christ, and would not have needed to be repeated.*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.111*

7. What is meant by their being remembrances of sin? Ans.-Their continued sacrifices were continual acknowledgments of sin. *Verse 3.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.112*



8. Why were their sins kept in continual remembrance? *Verse 4.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.113*

9. What is Christ represented as saying when he came into the world? *Verse 5.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.114*

10. Did this mean that the Lord would not have any sacrifice?*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.115*

11. From what scripture is this quoted? *Psalms 40:6-8.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.116*

12. For what can we say a body was prepared him? Ans.-For a sacrifice in contrast with those undesirable ones that could not take away sin.*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.117*

13. Where was it written that he should thus come? *Hebrews 10:7.* The volume of the book doubtless refers to the Pentateuch; for the Saviour said that Moses wrote of him, and that all things written in the law of Moses concerning him must be fulfilled. *John 5:46; Luke 24:44.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.118*

14. For what did he say he came? *Hebrews 10:7.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.119*

15. What two things are spoken of in *verses 6 and 7*? Ans.-Burnt-offerings and the will of God?*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.120*

16. What do we learn concerning the will of God in the verse from which this is quoted? *Psalms 40:8.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.121*

17. Is the law the will of God? Ans.-There is no difference between the will of God and the law of God. The law of any ruler is his will. See *Romans 2:17, 18, etc.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.122*

18. Where did Christ say the law was? *Psalms 40:8.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.123*

19. Where did God promise to put his law, in the new covenant? *Hebrews 8:10.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.124*

20. Who is the mediator for the fulfillment of this promise?*SITI*

*March 3, 1890, page 91.125*

21. Would he make the sacrifice that he did, to accomplish this, if the law were not in his own heart? *SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.126*

22. What is meant by his taking away the first? *Hebrews 10:9.SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.127*

23. What is the second, that he came to establish? See note. *SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.128*

#### NOTE

*Verse 9* has also been obscured by the unwarranted additions of theologians, who have put their theories into their translations. In a certain translation of the New Testament, of high pretensions, it is made to read, "He taketh away the first will that he may establish the second." But there are no two wills spoken of in the text. The rendering is intended to be equivalent to this: He taketh away the first covenant, that he may establish the second. No one is warranted in putting an idea into a text which is not written in the text, merely because the idea may be true. That construction is altogether foreign to the apostle's train of reasoning. There is a contrast presented throughout in *verses 5-9*, as follows:-*SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.129*

1. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire." "I come to do thy will." *SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.130*

He takes away the first, that he may establish the second. In this is found the only contrast in the argument, and it is made very prominent. The sacrifices and offerings of the Mosaic law could not perfect the conscience, could not reform the life, could not write the law of God in the heart. These are taken away, that he may come in whose heart is the law, and who alone can fulfill the promise of the new covenant. *SITI March 3, 1890, page 91.131*

## March 10, 1890

“Religion and the Church” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

When so much is said *pro* and *con*, about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by “the church.” Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If in squeaking of the church “we should refer to some special denomination, we would thereby imply that no other denomination could be a part of “the church.” With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term “the church” with reference to any particular sect.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.132*

In the Bible “the church” is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that “he is the head of the body, the church” (*Colossians 1:18*); and again he says that God “hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.” *Ephesians 1:22, 23*. Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the church, as Paul says, “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,” and that this body is Christ is shown by the words, “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.”*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.133*

“The church,” then, in the strict sense of the word, is composed of those who are “in Christ,” who have been converted, “born again,” and are consequently “new creatures.” From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them together, can be called “the church.” Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of “the church,” because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.134*

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the church is known only to

Him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of his church. Thus we *assume*, since we cannot *decide*, that such individual's profession is an honest one.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.135*

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the church. It is that which makes the church, and without that there is no church.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.136*

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether or not the Religious Amendment party is in favor of a union of Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the New York Convention of the National Reform Association held in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards of Peoria, Ill., said:-*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.137*

"It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen, of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant, or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all other sects, or that all these sects would combine to effect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate upon principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. That is a good thing-and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions."*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.138*

Exactly, and right here do we see the omen of a union of Church and State. We do not expect that in this country the Catholic Church will be the State Church, nor that any one of the Protestant sects will be honored by an alliance with the State. Neither do we look for

all the sects to combine and sink their individual names and thus form a union with the State. But we do look for a desperate effort to unite Church and State, and we claim that this effort will be made by the so-called National Reform party. And further, we claim that Dr. Edwards has admitted, even while denying it, that such union is the avowed object of that party. We leave it to the candid reader if the short argument at the beginning of this article, defining “the church,” taken in connection with Dr. Edward’s positive declaration, does not prove that a union of Church and State is the grand object sought by the Amendmentists.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 91.139*

“But,” says one, “do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?” We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any men religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.1*

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true religion marks one as a real Christian—a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so, likewise, the profession of religion by the State constitutes a State church. This is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment party is pledged to bring about.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.2*

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding? E. J. W.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.3*

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:10-20” The Signs of the Times, 16, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 25, March 22, 1890.)**

1. For what did Christ take away the sacrifices of the law of Moses?*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.4*

2. What do we learn in the Scriptures is the will of God?*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.5*

3. What is done for us by this will? *Hebrews 10:10.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.6*

4. What is the law called in *Psalms 119:142*?*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.7*

5. What did the Lord Jesus say in his prayer for our sanctification? *John 17:17.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.8*

6. Is the truth necessary for our sanctification? Ans.-It is; error, however fine in appearance, however firmly believed, has no sanctifying influence.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.9*

7. Are we sanctified by hearing the truth? Compare *John 3:19; 15:22; Matthew 7:26, 27.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.10*

8. Are we sanctified by believing the truth? *James 2:14, 17, 20, 26.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.11*

9. What is necessary in order to be sanctified through the truth? *1 Peter 1:22.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.12*

10. Can all truth be obeyed? Ans.-It cannot. To be obeyed it must be in the form of law. There can be no obedience where there is nothing commanded.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.13*

11. Is that truth sanctifying which does not call for obedience?  
*James 2:19.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.14*

12. Is it therefore of no profit because it will not sanctify? See note.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.15*

13. What did God say the children of Israel should be if they would keep his commandments? *Exodus 19:6.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.16*

14. Can we, then, be sanctified by our obedience to the law? Ans.- We cannot. See note.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.17*

15. How does Paul say that we are sanctified by the will of God? *Hebrews 10:10. Compare 2 Timothy 3:15.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.18*

16. After our High Priest offered his sacrifice, where did he go? *Hebrews 10:12.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.19*

17. What is he expecting-waiting for? *Verse 13.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.20*

18. Who puts his enemies under his feet? *Psalms 110:1. Compare 1 Corinthians 15:27, 28.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.21*

19. Where have we liberty to enter? *Hebrews 10:19.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.22*

20. What is meant by the holiest? Ans.-It is, literally, the holies, that is, the heavenly sanctuary.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.23*

21. By what means do we enter there? *-Ib.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.24*

22. Do we enter there actually, or in person? Ans.-No; we enter in the person of our Priest as a man is said to appear in court when his advocate is there for him.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.25*

23. By what manner of way do we enter there? *Verse 20.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.26*

24. With what is the new and living way in contrast? Ans.-With the sacrifices of the Mosaic law, which were dead when their blood was offered in the sanctuary.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.27*

25. What is that way?-*lb.* See note.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.28*

#### NOTES

By *2 Timothy 3:16, 17* we learn that all truth is profitable, but truths are not all of the same nature, and are not all equally profitable. Some truths are primary, some are secondary. In *James 2:19* we are told that we do well if we believe that there is one God; that is a very important truth, which, unfortunately, some nations of the earth have entirely forgotten. But it does not call for obedience-nobody can obey an abstract statement of that kind. It only calls for belief. And the demons believe it, and they remain demons still, even though they tremble before that truth. They are not sanctified by their belief, because it works no change of character; it is dead. But he who does the will of that one God is sanctified thereby, because he thereby forms a character in harmony with that will. While the law of God is that primary truth, which directly sanctifies, other truth is secondary; it can only work indirectly in our sanctification. But it leads toward sanctification, even indirectly, only when it leads us toward the law-to the way of obedience.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.29*

We could be sanctified by obedience to the law if we had never forfeited our justification and destroyed our ability by disobedience. Instead of now being justified by the law, we already stand condemned, for we have all disobeyed it. *Romans 3:9, 19, 23*. Sin has perverted our natures, so that alone we can do nothing. *John 15:5*. But that does not destroy the fact that the law is perfect, and is justifying in its virtue. That the law cannot justify us is not the fault of the law-it is our own fault. The law did not fall in the fall of man; the law does not become sin because we sin. *Romans 7:7-14*. The law is the measure and rule of the righteousness of God; it witnesses to that righteousness. *Romans 3:21*. By our fall we are far below the righteousness of the law, and we are now dependent upon another to raise us up to where its righteousness may be



fulfilled in us. *Romans 8:4.SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.30*

There is a fund of instruction in this expression in *Hebrews 10:20*. It is not a “way of life,” as some have construed it, but a way ever new, ever living. Our Sacrifice is alive forever, and his blood is ever fresh, precious, incorruptible. *1 Peter 1:18, 19*. This great truth is denied by the Catholics by their doctrine of transubstantiation. They affirm that there is no sacrifice now available for man, except upon their altars, where the water and wine are turned into the actual body and blood of Christ. In that doctrine the sacrifice of Christ is not even new, but needs ever to be renewed; the body and blood need a constant re-creating. By it the contrast between the daily offerings of the old law, and the one offering of Christ, is utterly destroyed.*SITI March 10, 1890, page 151.31*

## March 17, 1890

“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 10:21-25” The Signs of the Times, 16, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

### (Lesson 26, March 29, 1890.)

1. Where is our High Priest? See *Hebrews 8:1*, 2. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.1*
2. To what purpose did he go to heaven as a priest? *Hebrews 9:26. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.2*
3. Are we said to go into the sanctuary, or holies? *Hebrews 10:19. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.3*
4. How may we approach the throne? *Verse 22, first part. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.4*
5. How does faith come? *Romans 10:17. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.5*
6. What is necessary to full assurance of faith? See note. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.6*
7. What is a true heart? Ans.-A heart that clings to the ground of faith, the word of God. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.7*
8. What is said to be done to the heart? *Hebrews 10:22. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.8*
9. What is said to be sprinkled upon the heart to purify it? See 1 *Peter 1:2; Hebrews 12:24. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.9*
10. Is the heart literally sprinkled with blood? *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.10*
11. How is the blood of Christ applied to our hearts? Ans.-By our faith and the work of the Holy Spirit. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.11*

12. What is said to be done to the body? *Hebrews 10:22, last part.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.12*

13. Is the body literally washed with water?*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.13*

14. Is either of these words ever used for baptism? Ans.-They are not. Washing is used for the object or end of baptism in *Acts 22:16*. Baptism describes the action, by which the washing was accomplished.*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.14*

15. How should we hold our profession of faith? *Hebrews 10:23.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.15*

16. What is said of him that wavereth? *James 1:6.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.16*

17. Why are we encouraged to hold fast without wavering? *Hebrews 10:23, last part.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.17*

18. What is meant by considering one another? Ans.-Having regard for; watching over for good. *Verse 24.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.18*

19. What is meant by provoke? Ans.-To incite; to stimulate.*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.19*

20. Unto what should we incite one another?-*lb.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.20*

21. What should we not forsake? *Verse 25.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.21*

22. What should we do in our assemblies?-*lb.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.22*

23. Is the duty to exhort one another confined to meetings?*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.23*

24. Does the apostle specify any particular time for assembling?*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.24*

25. What special reason is given why we should exhort one another?*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.25*

26. To what day does the apostle here refer? Ans.-The day of which he has spoken, when our Redeemer will come again. He has introduced no other.*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.26*

27. Is it, then, true that we can see the day approaching? *Matthew 24:3, 32, 33, etc.SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.27*

#### NOTE

Many people mistake strong feeling for an assurance of faith, though they are essentially different. Strong feeling may be an accompaniment of faith, though it is not faith itself. And many suppose that there can be no faith without a happy state of feeling, which is a great mistake. Paul had great faith, though circumstances caused him to have great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart. *Romans 9:2*. Compare *Isaiah 50:10*; *Matthew 5:4*. Faith rests entirely upon the word of God, but feeling is often the outgrowth of impressions, produced in various ways. Self-complacency, deep satisfaction over one's own experience, is very often mistaken for assurance of faith, while, oftentimes, the individual has no faith at all-no clear conception of the teachings of God's word. Full assurance of genuine faith is unwavering confidence in God, with knowledge of his word and implicit belief of the word. The clearer the word is to our understanding, the better is the chance for full assurance of faith; for how can we have faith in that of which we are ignorant? The mystical system of interpreting the Scriptures, by which they are made to mean anything that can be imagined, precludes faith. Under that system the mind is filled only with fancies, while faith is something substantial. This subject is fully considered in the next chapter.*SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.28*

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES

"Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together." God has made man a social being. Intercourse with his fellows is a law of his nature, and man cannot reach his full development as a man

without this. This is especially true as regards Christian character. God has set in his church different gifts, which are likened to different members, or parts of the human body. (See *1 Corinthians 12*.) As each part of the body is mutually dependent to a greater or less extent on every other part in order to full and perfect development, so the various members and gifts in the church need the aid and instruction to be received from all. They are to “edify [or build up] one another” (*1 Thessalonians 5:11*); to “comfort one another” (*chap. 4:18*); and, if connected with Christ, the head, they will in this way be “fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love” (*Ephesians 4:16*). *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.29*

He who thinks to live a Christian life, separate from his kind, will find himself dwarfed in the end. That hill of corn, or maize, best filled and more nearly perfect is not found alone, or on the outskirts of the cornfield, but in the middle of the field. The pollen of its neighbors fertilizes then every kernel represented by the “silks.” One hill standing alone will be wanting. It needs the aid and abundance of the many to supply its wants; as it also may unite with the many in supplying others needs. Stones become polished by contact; characters are somewhat similar. Therefore the people of God should meet together to warn, exhort, instruct, and comfort, and so build one another up in the most holy faith. He who can meet with others of like precious faith and fails to do so, will bring only barrenness to his soul. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.30*

But someone will say: “I am all alone. I live near no one who believes as I do. Those truths so dear to me I cannot talk with others. What shall I do? Am I to grow spiritually poor because of that which is not my fault?” Not at all. God asks no more of us than what it is possible for us to perform through grace. If we can meet with the living members of Christ’s body, that is our duty; if we cannot, there are other means which God will provide. There are his holy word, the writings of his faithful servants in good books and papers; there is the soul communion with him. God “giveth more grace” to the lonely ones who trust him and improve their opportunities. Neither are those who do meet with each other, to

neglect the aids of the word of God, prayer, and instructive reading. Greater privileges bring greater responsibilities. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.31*

“And so much the more as ye see the day approaching.” This does not mean that we should meet more and more frequently, continually increasing the times of assembling; for this would after awhile lead to continuous meeting; and continuous meeting alone will not develop Christian character. The character must be settled, hardened, established, by meeting in the grace and strength of Christ the trials and conflicts of life. It means that we should so much the more not forsake the assembling of ourselves together and exhorting one another. As the day of God draws near, perils thicken around the little flock; the enemy brings upon them sorer temptations. So much the more ought they not to neglect every means of grace. Courage and faith in God should be their watch word. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.32*

Yet as the day draws near there will be strong temptations not to do this; there will be apparent duties to plead, physical disability or physical disinclination will be presented as an excuse. The “enchanted ground” lies just before the land of Beulah. And as Christian and Hopeful could only resist its influence by talking over the things of God, so will the people of God in the last days have to use every means of grace or be overcome by its baneful, deadly opiate. Prudence and safety demand a fulfillment of duty in meeting together whenever possible. *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.33*

There is another side. God makes precious promises to those who will do this. When only two or three meet in his name there will the Lord be. *Matthew 18:20*. And in speaking of the time when “that day” is near, the Lord thus speaks through the prophet: “Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another; and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him.” *Malachi 3:16, 17. SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.34*

We can see, or perceive, that the day of the Lord is approaching by the signs which God has given in his prophetic word, compared with the condition of things in the last days. The multiplying events in the physical world, in Church and in State, will show the fulfillment of God's word, and will thereby strengthen faith and assure us that the day is nigh. It will, however, be ushered in by no great physical portent or omen. God will decide the time in heaven, Christ will leave his priestly throne; and the eternal fiat will go forth (*Revelation 22:11, 12*). That day will come upon the earth as a thief (*2 Peter 3:10*), but it will not overtake the faithful, watchful brethren in Christ (*1 Thessalonians 5:3*). The thief spoils the house of him who sleeps and watches not; but to the faithful watcher every sign and omen is noted. "Let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober." *SITI March 17, 1890, page 155.35*

## March 31, 1890

**“Another Sunday Prosecution in Tennessee”** *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

In Troy, Obion County, Tennessee, Mr. R. M. King has just been tried for working upon Sunday, and upon conviction has been fined seventy-five dollars and costs. The circumstances of the case are somewhat peculiar, and are very significant. The indictment read as follows:-*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.36*

“The Grand Jurors of the State of Tennessee, elected, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire in and for the body of the county of Obion, in the State aforesaid, upon their oath present, that R. M. King, late of said county, laborer, heretofore, to wit: on the 23rd day of June, A.D. 1889, and on divers other Sundays before and after that date, and up to the taking of this requisition in the county of Obion aforesaid, then and there did unlawfully and unnecessarily engage in his secular business and performed his common avocation of life, to wit: plowing on Sunday, and did various other kinds of labor on that day, and on Sundays before that day, without regard to said Sabbath-days. Said work was not necessary, nor done as a matter of charity; and the doing of said work on said day was and is a disturbance to the community in which done, was offensive to the morals of the public, and is a common nuisance. So the Grand Jurors aforesaid present and say that said R. M. King was in manner and form aforesaid guilty of a public nuisance by such work on Sunday, in a public place, prejudicial to public morals, contrary to the statute, and against the peace and dignity of the State.”*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.37*

The first and chief witness for the prosecution did not see the defendant at his work for more than five minutes, as he was not in sight of any place of public worship. On cross-examination he said that the work was very annoying to his feelings, on the ground that it was a violation of sacred and civil law. He admitted that Mr. King was in other respects a quiet, peaceable, law-abiding citizen, and a pious, Christian gentleman, but that he did not favor Mr. King's



religious views. It should be stated that Mr. King is a Seventh-day Adventist.*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.38*

The judge ruled that the questions as to the defendant's religious character were not in order. The lawyer for the defense drew from two of the witnesses that they and certain others had bound themselves by a written pledge to prosecute every violation of the Sunday law. The defendant offered to prove that others who made no pretense of observing any other day than Sunday, did at the same time engage in reaping wheat with a machine, rating logs, etc., on Sunday, but this evidence the court would not allow. Of course this evidence would not make the defendant's guilt any less, if there were any guilt attaching to Sunday labor, but it would show the animus of the prosecution.*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.39*

The cross-examination showed that the third, fourth, and fifth witnesses for the prosecution were themselves engaged in secular labor when they saw Mr. King at work. But they had not rested on the seventh day.*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.40*

The defendant also offered to prove, which was a fact, that he had been tried before a justice of the peace, and had been fined for the identical work which was cited as the principal offense in the indictment, namely, plowing on the 23rd of June last, but this evidence the judge would not allow.*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.41*

The speed of the prosecuting attorney was a tirade against Seventh-day Adventists, and was full of indecency, which was calculated to please the vulgar. Said he:-*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.42*

"I wish to God we had more Methodist Churches, and more Baptist Churches, and more Presbyterian Churches, and more Episcopal Churches, and more Catholic Churches, until every man was brought under the benign influence of these churches; but, in the name of God, I do not want any of these Adventist Churches, or Mormon Churches. Gitteau, when he had a revelation from God (and I expect he had a Seventh-day Adventist lawyer to defend him), took a pistol and shot down the ruler of the nation, and they hung him; and that is what they ought to do with all these

fellows.”*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.43*

Much more of the same sort, and much worse, was given, all of which showed that the spirit of the prosecution was not zeal for Sunday as the Sabbath, nor for good morals, but hatred for the Sabbath, and for those who observe it. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, where it will soon be heard.*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.44*

Thus we have another instance of the working of religious legislation. From the days of Constantine down, evil and nothing but evil has come from State laws in favor of any religious practice. Would that men would learn that “God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth,” and not by civil enactments. E. J. W.*SITI March 31, 1890, page 155.45*

## April 21, 1890

**“Sound Speech from a Baptist” The Signs of the Times, 16, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of April, a “Bible-Readers’ Conference” was held in the First Baptist Church in Oakland, which was conducted by the Rev. Drs. W. H. Pendleton, A. J. Frost, and Daniel Read. The subject for consideration the afternoon of the first day was “The Lord’s Day,” by the Rev. Daniel Read, L.L.D., of Los Angeles. After presenting his arguments to show that Sunday is the Lord’s day, and should be kept holy, to the satisfaction of the most of his audience, opportunity was given for questions, when the subject of the propriety of civil Sunday laws was introduced, and an hour was spent in discussing it. The doctor showed himself to be master of the subject, answering every one of the numerous questions without a moment’s hesitation, and in the best possible manner. Following are the principal points brought out. *SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.46*

In answer to the first question, he stated that the State had no right to enact Sunday laws, and that the church has no business to ask for such legislation. “Not even to stop the saloons?”-“No; we have no right to ask that saloons be closed because the first day of the week is the Lord’s day. Saloons should be closed every day.” *SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.47*

A member then asked if railroad employées should not be protected from being compelled to labor on Sunday. The doctor’s reply was that they needed no protection. Nobody forces them to labor, and nobody can compel them to labor if they don’t want to. The railroad simply presents the alternative of working on Sunday or quitting. In this country nobody is forced to work for another if he doesn’t want to. To the statement that the loss of a position in consequence of refusal to work on Sunday, would present to some the alternative of starving, he said: “Let them starve, then; Christians have died, and even starved to death, for their religion; and we are no better than they. A religion that is not worth suffering inconvenience for is not worth anything. We have no right to compel other people to come to

our ideas, in order that we may not suffer inconvenience.” He called attention to the fact that the church made its greatest advancement, and was the purest in doctrine and practice, when the laws instead of favoring it were all against it.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.48*

The doctor said further that, so far as society is concerned, a man has as much right to work on Sunday as on any other day of the week. He believed that every body ought to keep the first day of the week holy; but if his conscience doesn’t lead him to rest on that day, nobody has any right to compel him to rest. God takes no delight in force. Rest without religion is worth nothing, and there is no religion in Sunday rest that does not spring from conscientious conviction. Moreover, he said, enforced idleness leads to crime, since Satan will always find mischief for idle hands. Therefore, to compel men to rest on Sunday, when they have no religious conviction in the matter, is to increase wickedness, and this is the reason why there are more cases in the police courts on Monday mornings than on other meetings.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.49*

In line with this thought, the doctor added that for the church to ask aid from the civil law is to reject God. Just to the extent that the church asks the State to enforce religion it separates itself from God. “As Baptists,” said the doctor, “we cannot afford to go back on all Baptist principle and tradition.” To the statement that Christian people are in the majority in this country, and to the question if they should not see that laws are passed in harmony with the Bible, he replied: “Certainly; but, unfortunately, the Bible gives no sanction to force. It nowhere gives the State authority to legislate in matters of religion.”*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.50*

The question of protection to Sunday worship was then introduced, and the doctor stated that it should certainly be protected from disturbance, but just to the extent that the Seventh-day Adventists and the Jews were protected in their worship on Saturday. “We have no right,” he said, “to ask for any more protection than others.” He said that if a band was playing near a church on Sunday, they should be compelled to stop, and that likewise a force of carpenters at work on a building near a Seventh-day Adventist house of worship, should stop work during the time of service.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.51*

Someone then raised the query: "Suppose that there are but a handful of Adventists worshipping in their church on Saturday, and there are very many carpenters at work on the house close by, who should be protected, the majority or the minority?" The reply was that it is not a question of numbers, but of right. If there is only one man, and he a Chinaman, he is entitled to protection.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.52*

A lady then arose and made a pathetic plea for the closing of saloons on Sunday, in order to protect the boys on their only idle day. Said she: "Are we to be obliged to send the boys out as lambs among wolves, to be devoured? Shall not we close the saloons on this day, and thus protect the boys?" The doctor's reply was, "I would go a great deal farther than the sister would, and close the saloons on every day." That, of course, answered the question perfectly, but he did not let the matter rest there. He said that as to sending the boys out as lambs in the midst of wolves, that is just what the Saviour did: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." But we could have this assurance, that the great Shepherd never forsakes the sheep. The doctor thought that the protection of the great Shepherd was better for the lambs than that of the law.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.53*

As to protection to the boys, he further said that parents had that in their own hands. Teach the boys that whisky and narcotics are poisons; show them the evil of their use; ground them thoroughly in moral principle, and the Sunday saloon will not affect them.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.54*

In the above we have given in general only the substance of what was said. No point has been overstated; on the contrary, the positions were taken much more strongly than we have put them. It would be impossible, even with a verbatim report, to give an adequate idea of the force with which the doctor met every argument in favor of Sunday laws. We wish that every Baptist in the land could have been present; and we hope that in the coming campaign in California, in which it is designed to make the Sunday-law question play a prominent part, every Baptist, and every church member of every other denomination, could listen to Doctor Read's masterly arraignment of Sunday laws. We believe that if they could,

many would be convinced that loyalty to true Christian principle calls not for Sunday laws, but for earnest protest against any such device to destroy spiritually and to foster crime. E. J. W.*SITI April 21, 1890, page 155.55*

## April 28, 1890

**“The Fresno Camp-meeting” The Signs of the Times, 16, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

If the first camp-meeting of the season in California is an indication of what the remaining camp-meetings of the season will be, we are sure that it will be a good year for the cause in this State. The attendance exceeded that of any other camp-meeting in that part of the State. The number of tents on the ground was seventy. But the success of the meeting was not due to the number present, but to the Spirit of God, whose presence all felt and acknowledged.*SITI April 28, 1890, page 155.56*

The preaching was mainly directed to the imparting of instruction in church duties, the responsibilities of church members, their relation one to another, etc., and to unfolding the simple principles of the gospel. By the grace of God these efforts were so successful that many were led to rejoice in increased light and courage.*SITI April 28, 1890, page 155.57*

Sister White was present the last five days of the meeting, and her testimony was greatly blessed. Her oft-repeated assurance that “the Lord can do more for us in a minute than we can do for ourselves in a life-time,” was not without effect, and those who had been endeavoring to help themselves out of trouble, were moved to yield themselves to the Lord.*SITI April 28, 1890, page 155.58*

A special effort was made in the line of practical Sabbath-school instruction. This was appreciated, and many teachers will take hold of their work with more intelligent zeal than ever before. Much attention was also given to the canvassing work, and the cooking class was well attended.*SITI April 28, 1890, page 155.59*

During the meeting, and at its close, the expression, “This is the best meeting I ever attended,” was very frequently heard. It was not because of any great enthusiasm, or because feeling ran high, but because the Spirit of the Lord directed the minds of preachers and teachers, to bring forth from the word just those things that were

needed at the time. The promise of Christ concerning the Spirit, "He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," was verified. *SITI April 28, 1890, page 155.60*

The cause in Central California certainly stands in a better condition to-day than before the meeting. The people are prepared to take hold of the work more intelligently than ever before; and if they continue in the things which they have learned and have been assured of, eternal victory will certainly be theirs. To God be the praise for the victories gained by the truth in Fresno, and may all the people thank him and take courage. E. J. W. *SITI April 28, 1890, page 155.61*



## May 12, 1890

**“Saving Faith” The Signs of the Times, 16, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

“But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above); or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead). But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach: that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” *Romans 10:6-9. SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.62*

May we accept these words, especially the statement in the last verse, as literally true? Shall we not be in danger if we do? Is not something more than faith in Christ necessary to salvation? To the first of these questions we say, Yes, and to the last two we say, No, and refer to the Scriptures for corroboration. So plain a statement cannot be other than literally true and one that can be depended on by the trembling sinner. *SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.63*

As an instance in proof, take the case of the jailer at Philippi. Paul and Silas, after having been inhumanly beaten, were placed in his care. Notwithstanding their lacerated backs and their manacled feet, they prayed and sang praises to God at midnight and suddenly an earthquake shook the prison, and all the doors were opened. It was not alone the natural fear produced by feeling the earth rock beneath him nor yet the dread of Roman justice if the prisoners in his charge should escape, that caused the jailer to tremble. But he felt in that earthquake shock a premonition of the great judgment, concerning which the apostles had preached; and, trembling under his load of guilt, he fell down before Paul and Silas, saying, “Sirs, what must I do to be saved?” Mark well the answer; for here was a soul in sorest extremity and what was sufficient for him must be the message to all lost ones. To the jailer’s anguished appeal, Paul replied, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” *Acts 16:30, 31*. This agrees exactly with the words which we quoted

from Paul to the Romans.*SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.64*

On one occasion the Jews said unto Jesus, "What shall we do that we might work the works of God?" Just the thing that we want to know. Mark the reply: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." *John 6:28, 29*. Would that these words might be written in letters of gold and kept continually before the eyes of every struggling Christian. The seeming paradox is cleared up. Works are necessary, yet faith is all-sufficient, because faith does the work. Faith comprehends everything and without faith there is nothing.*SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.65*

The trouble is that people in general have a faulty conception of faith. They imagine that it is mere assent and that it is only a passive thing to which active works must be added. But faith is active and it is not only the most substantial thing but the only real foundation. The law is the righteousness of God (*Isaiah 51:6, 7*), for which we are commanded to seek (*Matthew 6:33*), but it cannot be kept except by faith, for the only righteousness which will stand in the Judgment is "that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." *Philippians 3:9*.*SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.66*

Read the words of Paul in *Romans 3:31*. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Making void the law of God by man is not abolishing it; for that is an impossibility. It is as fixed as the throne of God. No matter what men say of the law, nor how much they trample upon it and despise it, it remains the same. The only way that men can make void the law of God is to make it of none effect in their hearts by their disobedience. Thus in *Numbers 30:15*, a vow that has been broken is said to have been made void. So when the apostle says that we do not make void the law through faith, he means that faith and disobedience are incompatible. No matter how much the law-breaker professes faith, the fact that he is a law-breaker shows that he has no faith. But the possession of faith is shown by the establishment of the law in the heart, so that the man does not sin against God. Let no one decry faith as of little moment.*SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.67*

But does not the apostle James say that faith alone cannot save a man and that faith without works is dead? Let us look at his words a moment. Too many have with honest intent perverted them to a dead legalism. He does say that faith without works is dead and this agrees most fully with what we have just quoted and written. For if faith without works is dead, the absence of works shows the absence of faith; for that which is dead has no existence. If a man has faith, works will necessarily appear and the man will not boast of either one, for by faith boasting is excluded. *Romans 3:27*. Boasting is done only by those who trust wholly in dead works or whose profession of faith is a hollow mockery. *SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.68*

Then how about *James 2:14*, which says: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him?" The answer necessarily implied is, of course, that it cannot. Why not? Because he hasn't it. What doth it profit if a man say he has faith, if by his wicked course he shows that he has none? Must we decry the power of faith simply because it does nothing for the man who makes a false profession of it? Paul speaks of some who profess that they know God but who deny Him by their works. *Titus 1:16*. The man to whom James refers is one of this class. The fact that he has no good works-no fruit of the Spirit-shows that he has no faith, despite his loud profession, and so of course faith cannot save him; for faith has no power to save a man who does not possess it. *SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.69*

This is but a brief presentation of this subject. Much more ought to be said, and many difficulties that arise in honest people's minds ought to be met, and this will be done in due time. But the scripture cited should be sufficient to cause us to heed the exhortation to hold fast the profession of our faith, without wavering, "knowing that he is faithful that promised." E. J. W. *SITI May 12, 1890, page 155.70*

## May 19, 1890

“A Few Principles of Interpretation” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

The SIGNS OF THE TIMES is an expository journal. The main object for which it was established was to present Scripture truth in the simplest and clearest manner possible. It will ever be our endeavor to make it meet this object. We here wish to lay down for our readers a few of the principles which we shall invariably follow in our interpretation, and which, if followed in a prayerful and candid spirit, cannot fail to lead a person to a proper understanding of the sacred word. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.71*

1. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” *2 Timothy 3:16, 17*. We accept this fully, and apply it to the entire Bible. The Bible does not simply contain the truth, but it is the truth, and the whole truth. Aside from the Bible there can be no moral or spiritual truth and light. And whatever disagrees with the Bible, whether it be in the realm of morals or of science, must be false. The principle here laid down must underlie all sound biblical exegesis. If this be not admitted, it can be of no use to try to study the Bible. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.72*

2. The Bible is one connected, consistent, harmonious book. It is composed of many books, but these books form only one book. They are not independent one of another. This book was written by many different persons, yet it has only one author, and that is the Spirit of God. The different parts are inspired by the same Spirit, and have one purpose; there is a vital connection between them. They are characterized by oneness of thought. As Christ prayed that his disciples might be one, so that the world might know that the Father had sent him (*John 17:21*), so the perfect harmony between the various parts of the Bible is proof that it came from God. If we accept the Bible as the inspired word of God, we must expect to find it harmonious throughout, for God cannot deny himself. So whoever wishes to study the word of God with any

degree of satisfaction, must first fix in his mind the fact that the Bible cannot contradict itself. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.73*

As a corollary to this principle it might be stated that the Bible does not need to be "harmonized." To attempt that is a thankless task, because the Bible is already harmonized. It is an instrument that was tuned by the Almighty himself, and every string vibrates in harmony with every other. All that the Bible student has to do is to study the harmony that already exists. If two texts seem to be contradictory, the student may rest assured that he does not understand one or the other, or perhaps either one. But when the position which he holds on one text is upheld by other texts bearing on the same point, and is not contradicted by any other text; that is, when a position taken in regard to any text is consistent with the entire Bible, that of itself is evidence that that position is correct; for the Bible could not agree with a false position. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.74*

3. The Bible must interpret itself. By the Bible man may be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works;" hence it cannot need the addition of matter outside of itself. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.75*

4. One part of the Bible cannot be fully understood when taken by itself, apart from its connection, or without reference to the remaining portion of the Bible. This might also be called a corollary to the second proposition laid down. If the Bible is one connected whole, then all the parts are necessary to the formation of that whole. There is a mutual dependence between all the parts, and therefore in considering one part, attention must be given to the other parts. True, we may not misunderstand one portion of the Bible even though we study it by itself; but it is certain that we cannot have a complete understanding of it until we study it with reference to an entire book of the Bible as it is of a single text. There is no book of the Bible upon which light is not thrown by every other book in the Bible. To say that any two books in the Bible have no connection, is almost equivalent to saying that the Bible is not all inspired by the same Spirit. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.76*

4. Terms used in one place in the Bible, with a certain signification,

must have the same meaning attached to them in every other place where they occur, provided the same subject is under consideration. If this be not true, then we have no certain means of knowing what the Bible teaches. Let us apply this principle. In the eighth chapter of Daniel we find a symbolic prophecy in which certain days are mentioned. Now to say that these days mean literal days of twenty-four hours each, would make nonsense of the prophecy, for we should have several great kingdoms covering a period of only a little more than six years. But in *Ezekiel 4:3-6* we find another prophecy, also symbolic, in which a day is expressly declared to stand for a year. So we conclude that in every prophecy where a day is used as a symbol, it signifies a year. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.77*

In like manner we find horns used as a symbol in the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, in both of which chapters they are plainly declared to symbolize kingdoms. Therefore we justly conclude that wherever in the Bible a horn is used as a symbol, it represents a kingdom or a nation. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.78*

Let the reader study these principles well, and get them fixed in his mind, and they will help him out of many a difficulty in his study of the Bible. *SITI May 19, 1890, page 155.79*

## May 26, 1890

“Things We Should Know” The Signs of the Times, 16, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

As finite beings, our knowledge is necessarily limited. There are many things that it is impossible for us to know. In fact, that which we know is a very small amount in comparison with that which we do not know; and much of that which we think we know is only conjecture. People sometimes think they know a great deal about nature, but such ones only think so because of their ignorance of the vastness of God's works. So Isaac Newton, after a lifetime of contemplation of the works of nature, and investigation of physical phenomena, said that he was like a child playing with pebbles on the shore of the ocean, while the vast expanse was still before him unexplored. And when we come to things supernatural, our knowledge is still more limited. We can know nothing of them, except they are revealed in God's word. It is idle for us to conjecture concerning the size of the throne of God, the height of the tree of life, the width of the streets of the New Jerusalem, or of the river of water of life. These things have not been revealed to us, and hence it is not necessary that we should know them.*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.80*

But there are some things which are very plainly made known, and these things it is our duty to know. If we remain ignorant of them, it is a sin. Let us consider some of the things that we may and should know without any mixture of doubt.*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.81*

In *Deuteronomy 4:30* Moses says: “Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else.”*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.82*

This may be called the first element of knowledge, because whoever says, “There is no God,” is a fool. *Psalms 14:1*. A man may be ignorant of a great many things and yet not be a fool; but one who is ignorant of things existing around him, who is unconscious of the existence of the sun, the air, the works of creation, and who

looks upon all with indifferent eye,-such an one we say is a fool. But that is virtually the condition one must be in if he denies the existence of God, for God is known by his works. Says the psalmist, "For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." *Psalm 96:5*. Again, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." *Psalm 19:1*. *SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.83*

A knowledge of God is inseparably connected with a knowledge of his creative power. The psalmist says again: "Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." *Psalm 100:3*. This is shown still farther by the fact that the heathen lost their knowledge of God through failure to recognize his creative power. Thus Paul says that the heathen who know nothing of God are without excuse, because ever since the creation of the world the eternal power and godhead of God may be seen from the things that are made. And then he says that darkness came upon them "because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful." What would it be to glorify him as God? Evidently to properly recognize him as Creator, for it is that which distinguishes him as the one true God. Thus the psalmist, after declaring the power of God above all gods, says, "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name." *Psalm 96:8*. *SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.84*

But if we acknowledge God as Creator, and consider it in our heart, to what will that lead? It will lead to the perfect doing of his will. Obedience is due only to superiors by inferiors. It is a principle of law that one who is dependent on another is in duty bound to obey the will of that other just to the extent that he is dependent on him. Man is dependent upon God for *everything*,-"In him we live, and move, and have our being,"-and therefore he is in duty bound to yield obedience to the will of God in every particular. And if a man recognize this supremacy of God, and his own dependence, he will do the will of God. That obedience to God is a necessary consequence of a recognition of his supremacy, or, rather, is the only way in which his supremacy can be recognized, is shown by the following verses, one of which has already been quoted:-*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.85*



“Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else. Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments.” *Deuteronomy 4:39, 40.SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.86*

The same thing is still further seen by the fact that ignorance of divine truth springs directly from disobedience. Paul says that strong delusion shall come upon men to that they shall believe a lie, for the reason that they receive not the love of the truth. *2 Thessalonians 2:10-12*. And again he warns the people to watch lest they be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. *Hebrews 3:13.SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.87*

It will not be denied that a knowledge of God is of the utmost importance, and that it is a primary duty; and since we can retain our knowledge of God only by doing his will, how important it is that we keep his commandments. In obeying any precept of God we recognize his authority, and increase our knowledge of him; but there is one duty the performance of which leads especially to the knowledge of God. In *Exodus 31:13, 17*, we read these words of the Lord:-*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.88*

“Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” “It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.”*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.89*

Here the reason is given why the keeping of the Sabbath leads to a more perfect knowledge of God. The Sabbath commemorates the completed creation. The Sabbath is given for this very purpose. It can be properly kept only when we consider the wonderful power and goodness of God. In the ninety-second psalm, which is for the Sabbath-day, the psalmist speaks of the necessity of praise to God, and says: “For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands.” *Verse 4.SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.90*

The same thing that is stated in Exodus is repeated by the Lord

through the prophet Ezekiel: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." *Ezekiel 20:12, 20*. In these words the Lord expressly declares that the Sabbath is the only means that he has given whereby men may preserve a knowledge of him. And as when we read the command, "Know ye that the Lord he is God," it is equivalent to a command to keep the Sabbath. *SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.91*

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This is the day which commemorates creation. No other day calls attention to the power of God. Changing the day of rest is the first step toward complete loss of knowledge of God. When we read that the heathen became what they are because "when they knew God they glorified him not as God," and remember that the glory of God is his creative power, and that keeping the Sabbath is the means by which we recognize that power, we do not see how the conclusion can be avoided that the first step toward the degradation revealed in *Romans 1:23-31* was the refusal to keep the Sabbath which God had sanctified. *SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.92*

The "man of sin" became such by thinking to change the times and the laws of God. The attempted change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week is the boast of the Catholic Church. To this she points as the badge of her authority. And this fact marks the Papacy as essentially heathen. Thus: By the act of changing the Sabbath it claimed the place and authority of God. Paul says of the Papacy: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." *2 Thessalonians 2:4*. One power can usurp the place of another only by changing, or attempting to change, its laws. But if the Papacy puts itself in the place of God, showing itself to be God, it must necessarily ignore the existence of the only true God; and thus it is that by changing the Sabbath the Papacy becomes essentially heathen. It matters not that the Papacy makes great pretensions to godliness. Profession counts for nothing unless the action corresponds. Paul says of certain ones. "They profess that they

know God; but in works they deny him.” *Titus 1:16.SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.93*

It is the rejection of the truth that is going to land the mass of the people of the last days in the worst kind of infidelity. See 2 *Thessalonians 2:9-12*. The Sabbath of Jehovah was, so far as we have any record, the first truth revealed to man (see *Genesis 2:1-3*), and it is the primary and most essential truth, since it pre-eminently teaches the existence and power of God. It is this truth which the Papacy has sought to overthrow, thus putting itself in the place of God; it is against this truth that Satan, the arch-enemy of God, exerts all his hellish arts, that he may lure men from allegiance to God; and it is the rejection of this truth which will make men an easy prey to Satan’s strong delusion, and bring them under the wrath of God.*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.94*

Let us then keep the Sabbath of the Lord in spirit and in truth. Let us not substitute a way of our own choosing, thus exalting ourselves to the place of God. If by the faith of Christ we earnestly strive to keep the commandments of God, we shall “follow on to know the Lord;” and in the earth made new, where all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, we shall be permitted every Sabbath (*Isaiah 66:23*) to see God and to worship before his throne, acknowledging his goodness and power, in that he hath made all things new.*SITI May 26, 1890, page 155.95*

## June 2, 1890

**“Things We Should Know. No. 2” The Signs of the Times, 16, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment.” *Ecclesiastes 11:9.SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.96*

Here is another thing we must know. The knowledge of this naturally follows from the knowledge of the existence of God. He is our Creator, and therefore has a right to claim that we shall do his will; but if this is so, it necessarily follows that judgment must be passed upon us, to see if we have done his will. The text is addressed to young men; but since God is no respecter of persons, we must conclude that all classes of people will alike be brought into judgment.*SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.97*

That all the world will be brought into judgment, is positively stated in the Bible. In his sermon on Mars Hill, Paul said that God “now commandeth all men every where to repent: Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.” *Acts 17:30, 31.SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.98*

What shall be the standard of the final judgment? If we are to know that for certain things God will bring us into judgment, it must be that we can know what to do in order to secure a favorable decision. We have already learned that, being wholly dependent on God, we are bound to conform to his will in every particular: therefore we must conclude that God’s will is to be the standard of judgment. This conclusion is supported by the words in the Lord’s prayer, which indicated that when God’s kingdom comes his will be done by all.*SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.99*

What then is the will of God, by which we are to be judged? Paul

gives the answer in the following words: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." *Romans 2:17, 18*. How was it that those whom Paul addressed knew the will of God? Because they were instructed out of the law. Then it must be that the law of God contains the will of God. This is still further shown by the words which David uttered prophetically in behalf of Christ: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." *Psalms 40:7, 8*. It was Christ's delight-more than his meat or drink-to do the will of God. He ever did the will of the Father. This was because the law of God was in his heart, so that all his actions were spontaneously in harmony with it. But acting in harmony with the law of God was doing the will of God; therefore the law of God is identical with his will.*SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.100*

Once more: When the young man came to Jesus and asked what he should do that he might inherit eternal life, Jesus answered, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." *Matthew 19:17*. In his sermon on the mount, he said: "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." *Matthew 7:21*. Therefore keeping the commandments of God is equivalent to doing the will of God.*SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.101*

The law of God, then, is to be the standard by which all men shall be judged. This is incidentally shown in the passage already quoted from Romans: "Thou knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." According to the marginal reading it is, Thou "triest the things that differ, being instructed out of the law." The law of God is that by which we try things that differ, by which we decide what things are honest and just and pure and lovely and of good report, and what are not. This, we say, is incidental proof that we are to be judged by the law of God, the ten commandments; for it is manifest that we must judge our actions by the same rule by which God will judge them.*SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.102*

In the text quoted at the beginning of this article, Solomon tells the

young man to have his own way if he will, to walk in the ways of his heart, and in the sight of his eyes, but to know that for “all these things” God will bring him into judgment. Then we are to know not only that there will be a judgment, but that the judgment will take into account our thoughts; for the ways of a person’s heart are the ways which his heart devises or thinks upon. This is plainly stated in the next chapter: “For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” *Ecclesiastes 12:14*. This agrees with the words of Paul, that when the Lord comes he will “bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.” *1 Corinthians 4:5*. *SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.103*

We have seen that the judgment is to be in accordance with the law of God; and since every secret thought is to be brought into judgment, it follows that the law of God takes account of even the thoughts of the heart. Read now *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*: “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.” Here we see that the fact that God will bring every secret thing into judgment, is given as a reason why we should keep the commandments of God. This shows again that the law is so spiritual as to detect the slightest deviation from it even in thought. *SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.104*

With this agree the words of Paul: “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” *Hebrews 4:12*. As showing how the law discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, we refer to the words of Christ in *Matthew 5:18-22, 27, 28*, where we find that a single hateful thought or lustful look is accounted a violation of the sixth or the seventh commandment. *SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.105*

There is an intimate connection between *Ecclesiastes 11:9* and *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*. The latter text is an exhortation to keep the commandments of God, based on the truth that by those commandments God will bring “every work into judgment, with

every secret thing.” The former text is an emphatic command to those who seem bent on having their own way, to know that “for all these things” God will bring them into judgment. And since that judgment is to be based on the commandments of God, and is to take into account every secret thought, it follows that *Ecclesiastes 11:9* is virtually a command for us to know that the ten commandments cover every possible deed or thought, and demand perfect obedience. It is a command for us to study the law, and to meditate in it day and night. If we are ever at a loss to know how perfect the law requires us to be, we have only to consider the life and character of Jesus. He “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” This was simply because the law was in his heart. Anyone who models his life in accordance with the law of God, will be just like Christ, and the law will be satisfied with nothing less. *SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.106*

This righteousness cannot be attained by our own individual effort. Of ourselves we can do nothing; but Christ, who knew no sin, was made to be sin for us, in order “that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” And in the command to know that God will bring us into judgment for every secret thing, includes the command not only to know that the law of God is to be the standard of that judgment, but also that through Christ alone can we attain to that perfect righteousness which the law demands. If Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, then we can exhibit in our actions the righteousness of the law, for if we have Christ in the heart we must have the law there also. And having lived thus, when we are brought before the judgment seat, and God fixes upon us his piercing grace, he will see, not us, but the image of Christ, and because he lives we shall live also. *SITI June 2, 1890, page 155.107*

**June 9, 1890**

**“Christ, the Sinless One” The Signs of the Times, 16, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the last number but one of the last volume of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, we published a short editorial note in reply to a question that was raised in a certain Sabbath-school, as to Christ's power to sin when he was here on earth. The statement was there made that he could not. We quote a portion of the note:-*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.108*

“Our whole hope of eternal life through Christ rests upon this; for if there had been any temptation that could have induced Christ to sin, that would show that there is temptation that is stronger than divine power, which, in turn, would show that he is not “able to save to the uttermost.”*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.109*

The question is simply another form of asking: “Can God sin?” for “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.” “The word was God,” just as truly when it was “made flesh and dwelt among us,” as it was in the beginning, “before the world was.” The object of that mysterious union of divinity with humanity was to demonstrate the power of God over sin.”*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.110*

We have received several letters in regard to this note, one brother claiming that it is in direct conflict with the following statement made by Mrs. E. G. White: “If it were not possible for him [Christ] to yield to temptation, he could not be our helper.” We are sure that it does not conflict with that statement. The misunderstanding is an instance of the impossibility of giving all sides of a subject in one item. Perhaps we can relieve the minds of our questioners if we say that while holding to the statement previously made, we just as firmly believe the following:-*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.111*

Christ was made “to be sin for us.” *2 Corinthians 5:21*. He was made “in the likeness of sinful flesh.” *Romans 8:3*. He was “made of a woman, made under the law.” *Galatians 4:4*. He took on Him the nature of Abraham, and was *in all things* “made like unto his



brethren,” and “he himself hath suffered being tempted.” *Hebrews 2:17, 18*. He was “in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” *Hebrews 4:15*. These scriptures convey no other meaning to our mind than that Christ voluntarily took upon himself the feeble nature of man, to be subject to all the tendencies of the flesh, and the temptations of the devil. In short, he deliberately put himself into exactly the same position that fallen man occupies, to feel in his own being the full force of the power of Satan working upon fallen humanity. The temptations to which he was subject were real, not fanciful, and the strength of them equaled the strength of all the temptations that all the men in the world have to endure. The human nature that he took was a sinful nature, one subject to sin. If it were not, he would not be a perfect Saviour. We could not then go to him as one who is “touched with the feeling of our infirmities.” *SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.112*

We do not think this side of the case can be stated any more strongly; and yet we see no reason to recall the statement before made. If Joseph could say, in the face of strong temptations, “How then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?” (*Genesis 39:9*); if the beloved disciple could write by inspiration of the Spirit, “Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God” (*1 John 3:9*); surely it may be said of the only-begotten Son of God, in whom dwelt “all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” that he could not sin. *SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.113*

Take another point of view. Temptation comes through the working of Satan upon the frailty of human flesh, of which Christ himself was a partaker. We know that Satan in person put forth all his power on Jesus, not only in the wilderness, but through his whole earthly ministry, knowing that the fate of all men depended on him. If it had been possible for Satan to induce Christ to sin, he would have done it. The fact that Christ “did no sin”—that he “knew no sin,” although subjected to the severest assaults of Satan, is sufficient to show that he could not be induced to sin. *SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.114*

This is the idea intended to be conveyed in the note referred to. In one sense, it was possible for Christ to sin, provided he had wished to, for the nature which he took was a nature subject to sin. Yet it

was impossible for him to sin, because “God was in Christ,” and that in perfect fullness. Not simply did he have the power of God with him, but he was God, for even when he lay a babe in the manger at Bethlehem, the decree went forth, “Let all the angels of God worship him.” *Hebrews 1:6*. He never ceased to be God, and therefore he did not sin. He demonstrated in his own person the power of divinity to prevail against the power of Satan working through human weakness. *SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.115*

But someone will say, “I cannot understand this.” Neither can we. When we can understand how Christ could humble himself to the position of a servant, and become a man, and still retain his divinity; when we can understand how he could be at the same time God and man; when we can understand how the Mighty One who made the heavens and the earth could be born a helpless infant in Bethlehem; in short, when we can understand the mind of God, and can comprehend infinity, then we will explain “the mystery of the gospel.” *SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.116*

We advise our friends not to try to explain these things. The fact that we cannot understand how a thing can be, argues nothing against it. Finite minds cannot comprehend the workings of Infinity. We can only accept as true the statements which that same divine power makes concerning itself. But we can take comfort in every revelation of divinity. We take the highest comfort in thinking that Christ voluntarily subjected himself to every condition and every weakness that it is possible for men to be subject to; and our comfort in this arises not less from the fact that there is thus a bond of sympathy established between us, than from the knowledge that “his divine power,” which was such that Satan could not by any possibility overthrow it, is that by which are “given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness.” *2 Peter 1:3*. E. J. W. *SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.117*

**“Newspaper Reading as a Preparation for Church” The Signs of the Times, 16, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent discourse on “The New Birth,” Mr. Moody spoke in the

following decided manner concerning the reading of newspapers on Sunday:-*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.118*

“I do not believe Gabriel himself could come down into this pulpit and preach with power to an audience that had been busy for two or three hours reading the Sunday papers. But someone says, ‘Be mild, Mr. Moody, or the papers will pitch into you.’ Let the papers pitch into me. I think the time has come for plain speaking. When ministers and members of the church buy newspapers on the street on Sunday morning from little boys who are kept out of the church and Sunday-school by selling these papers, I think someone should speak. I do not know what the Sunday papers contain. I never read one. I would as soon touch pitch; but I am told that the editors gather the scum from all over the world, and publish it on Sunday.”*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.119*

The New York *Observer*, which quotes and comments on the above says:-*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.120*

“It is greatly to be regretted that so many Christian people support the Sunday newspaper by purchasing it, and by advertising in its columns. It is a well-known fact that it receives a great deal more attention at the hands of its readers than the edition of any other day of the week, and this is why advertising is so readily found for the Sunday columns. Were every kind of support rendered by Christians withdrawn, it is questionable whether the Sunday edition would hold its own.”*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.121*

This prompts us to make a few remarks. We think there has been a good deal of misdirected effort in connection with this Sunday newspaper business, both on the part of those who want them suppressed by law, and by many who oppose all Sunday laws.*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.122*

In the first place, we will say that the Sunday newspaper is as good as that published on any other day of the week. We speak from actual knowledge. Its only difference from the editions of other days is that it is usually larger.*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.123*

Secondly, we can heartily agree with all that Mr. Moody and others say in regard to the demoralizing effect that the reading of the

newspapers before church service has upon the attendant at church. We are sure that he who reads the newspaper for an hour before going to church will not be likely to receive much benefit from the most powerful sermon. Therefore we have no fault to find with those ministers who severely condemn the practice.*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.124*

But let it not be forgotten that the evil effect does not depend entirely upon the day upon which the reading is done, nor at all upon the day on which the paper is printed. Reading newspapers is as poor a preparation for the mid-week prayer-meeting as it is for the preaching service. To be sure, newspapers are not the best nor even good reading for the Sabbath-day, and he who esteems Sunday as the Sabbath will not read them on that day; but so far as unfitting one for worship is concerned, they are no worse before the Sabbath service than just before the Tuesday or Wednesday evening prayer-meeting.*SITI June 9, 1890, page 155.125*

And, as we have already intimated, a newspaper published on Tuesday or Wednesday is just as demoralizing Sabbath reading as one published on the Sabbath or Sunday. The man who reads the Saturday evening paper on Sunday morning will be in no better frame of mind for church service than if he read one published on Sunday morning. This must be obvious to everybody.*SITI June 9, 1890, page 343.1*

Therefore, instead of fulminating against the Sunday paper, ministers and professional reformers should turn their attention to the delinquent church-members. Let them get up a genuine revival of religion in the church. Let them labor and pray for such a conversion of their flocks as shall make newspapers distasteful reading on the day of rest. The fault lies with the lax professors, and not with the newspapers, and the ax should be laid at the root of the tree. To lop off the Sunday newspaper would do no real good, so long as the desire for unspiritual reading remained. Those who are unfitted for church duties by reading the Sunday newspaper, would, in nine cases out of ten, read something worse if that were withheld from them. The existence of the Sunday newspaper, therefore, is no reason whatever for the enactment of Sunday laws.*SITI June 9, 1890, page 343.2*

In justice to Mr. Moody, it should be said that, so far as we are informed, he did not make the stereotyped plea for the suppression of the Sunday newspaper. His complaint, and it was a just one, was directed against those who pursue a practice that is inconsistent with their profession. E. J. W. *SITI June 9, 1890, page 343.3*

## June 16, 1890

**“Unrighteous Judgment, Self-Condemnation”** The Signs of the Times, 16, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

The epistle to the Romans is like a grand epic poem, in which the author gives in a few lines at the beginning an outline of the whole subject, and then proceeds to develop it. In the salutation and introduction, comprising the first seventeen verses of the first chapter, the apostle has given the whole gospel in a nutshell. From the statement that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, he naturally proceeds to show, in the remainder of the chapter, the necessity for the plan of salvation. This he does by portraying the deep darkness of the heathen world. In this arraignment the Jews would most heartily acquiesce; and the Gentiles could not gainsay it, for it was corroborated by their own writers. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.4*

But while the professed worshiper of the true God is contemplating the awful wickedness of the heathen, feeling a sort of contemptuous pity for their blindness, and congratulating himself because of his superiority, his complaisant meditations are rudely broken by the abrupt charge of the apostle:-*SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.5*

“Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things. But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?” *Romans 2:1-4. SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.6*

“Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest.” What a wonderful antidote to pride this would be if it were only borne in mind! The apostle has shown (see *chap. 1:19-21*);

that the heathen are without excuse, and now he extends the same remark to all mankind. If the heathen are without excuse, how much less excuse can there be for those who are sufficiently enlightened to sit in judgment upon the abominable practices of idolaters? Why does the mere fact of condemning the wicked practices of the heathen show a person to be without excuse?-Because he shows that he knows better than to do such things, and yet he himself does those very things. Let us see if this last charge can be sustained.*SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.7*

That all people in the world stand in the same condemnation before God is difficult for many to believe, because they see such a great difference in men. But it must be remembered that it is not charged that all are equally guilty, but that all are in the same condemnation. It must be remembered, also, that men can look only upon the outward appearance, while God looks upon the heart. Now the inspired word says:-*SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.8*

“The Lord looketh from heaven; he beholdeth all the sons of men. From the place of his habitation he looketh upon all the inhabitants of the earth. He fashioneth their hearts alike; he considereth all their works.” *Psalms 33:13-15. SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.9*

This does not mean that God is responsible for all the wickedness that is in the earth, nor that he has made the hearts of men all alike evil; but it does mean that human nature is the same everywhere. The natural impulses of the heart are just the same in America that they are in darkest Africa. It is a truth of Scripture that “all men are created equal.” The differences in men are due solely to surroundings and education.*SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.10*

Moreover, we have the testimony of Scripture that the same evils are common to all. Christ said: “For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness.” *Mark 7:21, 22*. Compare this list with that enumerated by the apostle in *Romans 1:29-31*, and it will be seen that the vices of the heathen are simply those which spring from unregenerate human nature. Compare, also, “the works of the flesh,” mentioned in *Galatians 5:19-21. SITI June 16, 1890, page*

Let no one charge the existence of these evils upon God, because it is stated that he fashioneth all hearts alike. "God made man upright;" it is man that is responsible for the evil. God made all men with capabilities for the highest good or the greatest evil, and man has corrupted his own way. It is man that treasures up to himself wrath; and in the day of wrath the sinner will receive only the wages that he has earned. The fact that the evil comes from the man, and that goodness comes from God, will appear more fully in the next article. Notwithstanding the evil that is in the world, God's goodness and justice are unimpeachable.*SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.12*

The law of God is spiritual; it deals with finer things than gross acts. "The word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." *Hebrews 4:12*. Therefore, as our Lord showed in the sermon on the mount, the law may be transgressed by a thought. "The thought of foolishness is sin. So the man who meditates murder, or who cherishes hateful, revengeful thoughts, is guilty of murder just as surely as the man who strikes down his fellow with the assassin's knife. The comparative degree of guilt can be determined by God alone."*SITI June 16, 1890, page 343.13*

From this standpoint there is not much chance for anybody to boast. Every man is guilty, and every time a man condemns any wrong in another, he shows the inexcusability of his own guilt. Infidels, and non-professors generally, often take delight in pointing out the follies and short-comings of professed Christians, forgetting that they are thereby passing severe condemnation on themselves; for they show that they well know what a person ought to do, and yet they do not do it.*SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.1*

But there is another practical thought to be considered in this connection. It is contained in the words of Christ: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." *Matthew 7:1, 2*. That the word "judge" is here used in the sense of



“condemn” is evident from the parallel record in *Luke 6:37*. This shows not only that those who judge others condemn themselves, as stated by Paul, but also that those who do not condemn others will not be condemned. Harsh judgment always comes from an evil heart. From the scriptures before us we are warranted in saying that when a man sits in judgment upon another, it is evidence that he himself is to some degree guilty of the same sin. The guilty soul loves to proclaim the guilt of another, that he may divert attention from his own. Let gossips and scandal-mongers make a note of this. Let not those who are ever ready to pronounce indignant sentence against evil think that they can thereby escape the righteous judgment of God. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.2*

In this connection we should also read *James 4:11, 12*: “Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law; but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy; who art thou that judgest another?” This puts in a most forcible light the evil of judging and condemning. To do this is to put one’s self in the place of God. God is the only lawgiver, therefore he alone has a right to judge. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.3*

Not only do we assume the authority of God, when we pass condemnation upon others, but we judge the law, and thereby put ourselves above God. How do we condemn the law?—In this way: The law is the standard of right and wrong; it alone, or its Maker, has the right to condemn. But when we condemn, we declare ourselves the standard, thereby judging the law to be wrong; for when we do not leave condemnation to the law, we virtually proclaim that it is not to be trusted. And since we are evil, and our judgment faulty, our condemnation is according to a faulty standard. Thus we in reality speak gross evil of the law by implying that it is inferior to our poor judgment. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.4*

It should be a caution to us, also, against judging our brethren, to know that in so doing we are working in the same line with Satan. He was cast out of heaven as the accuser of the brethren, “which accused them before our God day and night.” *Revelation 12:10*. Really, it is no small thing to pass condemnation upon others; it is

nothing less than partaking of the spirit of antichrist. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.5*

This does not mean that we are not to exercise our judgment as to what is right and what is wrong. The law of God is given to us for the purpose of enlightening our minds on this very point. But we are to decide for ourselves and not for others. A lesson should be learned from the Master, who, while he hated sin as man never hated it, could say to the sinful one whom guilty man would condemn. "Neither do I condemn thee." They who do not condemn will not be condemned, because it is only the souls that are filled with the Spirit of the Master, who will not be condemned, and such ones have first been filled with so great a sense of their own unworthiness that they thought themselves the chief of sinners; and the constant sense of God's mercy-unmerited favor-to them depends on the acknowledgment of their own fallibility. E. J. W. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.6*

**"The Sabbath-School. Trust in Our Heavenly Father. *Luke 12:22-34*" The Signs of the Times, 16, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

**Notes on the International Lesson.  
(June 22; *Luke 12:22-34*.)**

"And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for your body, what ye shall put on." *Verse 22*. The "therefore" implies a reason based on what has gone before. Why take no thought for these things?- Because "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." It is evident that the most anxious thought should be bestowed on that which constitutes the chief part of life, and that excludes the things that are merely physical. When Jesus said, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (*John 3:36*), he showed that he who lives only in this short life does not live at all. He knows nothing of life. Only the immortal life is worthy of being called life. It alone is life indeed. When one looks at the matter in this light, it is easy to see that food and raiment are very small items in life. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.7*

“Take no *thought*.” This gives no encouragement to improvidence and laziness. One part of the Bible does not cross another part, and the apostle Paul says that “if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” *1 Timothy 5:8*. See also *2 Thessalonians 3:10*. Dr. Marvin R. Vincent, in “Word Studies in the New Testament,” says of the word rendered “thought,” that, being derived from a word meaning *part*, it “was explained accordingly as a *dividing* care, distracting the heart from the true object of life. This has been abandoned, however, and the word is placed in a group which carries the common notion of *carnal thoughtfulness*. It may include the idea of *worry* and *anxiety*, and may emphasize these, but not necessarily.” He cites as instances of the use of the word in the sense of the laudable care, *1 Corinthians 7:32; 12:25; Philippians 2:20*, where the sense of worry would evidently be out of place. He then adds:—*SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.8*

“In other cases that idea is prominent, as, ‘the *care* of this world,’ which chokes the good seed. *Matthew 13:22*; compare *Luke 8:14*. Of Martha: ‘Thou art *careful*.’ *Luke 10:41*. Take thought, in this passage [*Luke 12:22; Matthew 6:25*], was a truthful rendering when the A.V. was made, since *thought* was then used as equivalent to *anxiety* or solicitude. So Shakespeare (‘Hamlet’):*SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.9*

‘The native hue of revolution  
Is sickled o’er with the pale cast of *thought*.’*SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.10*

And Bacon (Henry VII.): ‘Hawis, an old man of London, was put in trouble, and died with *thought* and anguish.’ Somer’s ‘tracts’ (in Queen Elizabeth’s reign): ‘Queen Catherine Parr died rather of *thought*.’ The word has entirely lost this meaning.... It is uneasiness and worry about the future which our Lord condemns here, and therefore the Revision rightly translates, *be not anxious*.”*SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.11*

“Consider the ravens; for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have store-house nor barn; and God feedeth them; how much more are ye better than the fowls?” Here, again, the Lord, while chiding

worry and useless anxiety, and teaching implicit trust in God, uses an illustration which precludes the idea of idly waiting for something to turn up. The birds do not sow nor reap nor gather into barns, as did the rich man who trusted in his possessions and forgot God, yet God feedeth them, while his anxiety profited him nothing. But God does not feed the birds while they sit on a limb of a tree with open mouths waiting for him to bring the food along. The psalmist, in praising God for his wonderful care for the dumb creatures, says of them: "These all wait upon thee; that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. That thou givest them *they gather*." *Psalm 104:27, 28*. They gather what God provides for them, and are content with that which suffices for the present. Since men are of far greater value than the birds, there is every reason to think that God will take far greater care of them than of the birds. Therefore men have far less cause for anxious care and worry than the birds have. If God does not forget the birds, how much more will he not remember man, whom he has made in his own image? The fact that Christ commended us to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," is proof that God designs for to give us each day the food that is necessary for that day. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.12*

In the same line, but stronger, is the reference to the flowers. Jesus said: "Consider the lilies how they grow; they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. If then God so clothe the grass, which is to-day in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith?" The clause, "Which is to-day in the field," is better as in the Revised Version: "The grass in the field which to-day *is*." That is, the grass in the field which to-day lives, and to-morrow is destroyed. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.13*

There is nothing more frail than the flowers of the field; and upon nothing else has God lavished a greater wealth of beauty. In the early spring the California plains are fairly dazzling with the brightness of myriads of flowers of different variety; yet in one day I have seen a plot of flowers so trodden down by men and cattle that no one would imagine that a flower had ever bloomed on the spot. What should we learn from this?—The infinite wealth of the resources of God. He can afford to clothe nature lavishly. And since it is in creation that the power and divinity of God are made known

to us (*Romans 1:20*), he designs that from this we should learn to trust him. We may thank God for the birds and the flowers; not simply because they please our senses, but because they are object lessons of God's tenderness. He who does not look at them in this light, does not derive from them half the comfort that he ought. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.14*

"Beneath His watchful eye,  
His saints securely dwell;  
That hand which bears all nature up  
Shall guard his children well." *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.15*

From all this, the practical, common-sense question is asked, "And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit? If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why take ye thought for the rest?" This is in effect, "Do not worry about that which you cannot affect." All the worrying in the world never accomplished a single thing; how foolish, then, to indulge in it, especially since it is an implied denial of God's care for us. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.16*

"But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good-pleasure to give you the kingdom." That is the one thing of worth. "The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." How foolish, then, for men to waste valuable time worrying about that which is but for a moment, and neglect that which is for eternity. Yet the worldling is far wiser than the professed Christian who plans chiefly for this world. The former has not had his eyes opened to see the world to come, and he plans as far ahead as he sees; but the latter has had opened before him an eternal inheritance, yet he plans only for the present. Truly, the children of this world are wiser in their generations than the children of light. *SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.17*

But although the kingdom of God is the one thing of worth, we are not to have anxious care and worry even for that. We are to seek it, yet with loving trust in the heavenly Father, who provides everything. We are commanded to "fear not," because it is his good-pleasure to give the kingdom. And right here, to strengthen

this assurance, comes in God's care for us in this present life. Surely he who cares so kindly for our temporal wants, will not neglect the greatest of all. Thus even the lilies become to us a pledge of God's love, and of his faithfulness to give us eternal riches; for the lilies are a pledge that God will care for our temporal wants far more than for theirs; and if he will do that which is least, he surely will do that which is greatest. And so we can say, with the psalmist, "For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands." E. J. W.*SITI June 16, 1890, page 359.18*

**June 23, 1890**

**“Goodness Leading to Repentance. *Romans 2:4*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(*Romans 2:4.*)**

“Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?” *Romans 2:4.SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.19*

It is very common for men to lay the blame of their sinful condition upon God; to say that they are just as God made them. This kind of talk is increasing, and the logical result is the denial of any future punishment for sin. But that such a position is directly contrary to Bible teaching, it needs only this verse to disprove. God cannot deny himself, and therefore he cannot work at cross-purposes. He cannot at one time deliberately set about to undo that which he has once done. That he has deliberately set about the salvation of men, the entire Bible attests. He manifested his hatred for sin, and his desire to rescue men from it, by giving his Son to die. This was the supreme manifestation of his goodness to lead men to repentance. All this effort to save men from sin is utterly inconsistent with the theory that God is any way responsible for sin.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.20*

The apostle tells us plainly that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.” *Romans 5:12*. The terrible depth of sin into which man fell, and the first act of God’s goodness to lead him from it, are brought to view in *Genesis 3:15*, where these words of the Lord to the serpent-Satan-are recorded: “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed.” The fact that God had to put enmity between man and Satan, shows that in the fall all of man’s natural enmity to Satan had been obliterated.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.21*

God made man in his own image, both physically and spiritually; but when man yielded to the tempter, he deliberately rejected God, and

became, body and soul, the servant of Satan. In that condition all his desires would have been for evil, and, like Satan and his angels, he would have had not the shadow of a desire to do right. Of course a simple offer of salvation from sin could not have been any benefit to a man in such a condition. "Wherefore is there a price in the hand of a fool to get wisdom, seeing he hath no heart to it?" Of what use to offer freedom from sin to a man incapable of appreciating goodness? Therefore as the first act in the great plan of salvation, God put into the heart of man an enmity against Satan. It was purely an act of divine love. And since this enmity has been a part of the inheritance of every one of Adam's race, it follows that not a man has lived in earth, no matter how wicked, who was not just to the extent that he ever had a thought of goodness, a subject of the grace of God.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.22*

It is this enmity implanted in the heart of men by God, upon which the Spirit works when it strives with men. It is this seed which the Spirit waters into fruitfulness, in those who will yield to its influence. Thus the Spirit of God, through his goodness, is leading all men toward repentance. God "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." *1 Timothy 2:4*. But all men will not be saved. Thousands say to the Spirit: "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee;" and still other thousands refuse to give it any recognition.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.23*

It is in this sense that God "is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." *1 Timothy 4:10*. His love is bestowed alike upon all; to all he comes as a Saviour; but only those will be saved who will accept salvation. It is thus, also, that Christ is "the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." *John 1:9*. Every man that has come into the world has had some rays of divine light shining into his heart,-enough to have led him into the glorious liberty of the children of God, if he had followed it; and for that light he was indebted to the grace of God in Christ.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.24*

The goodness of God is thus set forth by the apostle Paul: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world,



according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness toward us, through Christ Jesus.” *Ephesians 2:1-7.SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.25*

And that this goodness is manifested to men in sin, in order to deliver them from it, is shown also by these words to Titus: “For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” *Titus 3:3-7.SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.26*

But where shall we stop, if we attempt to recount the goodness of God, which is manifested to lead men to repentance, since the whole Bible, like the whole earth, “is full of his goodness.” Let us sum the whole matter up in one or two passages of Scripture. The first shall be *Hebrews 12:1-3:-SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.27*

“Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.” *SITI*

*June 23, 1890, page 359.28*

What was the joy that was set before Christ? It seems as though the question is fully answered in *Philippians 2:6, 7*, which says that although Christ was in the form of God, he “thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant.” The idea is, as expressed in the Revised Version, that he counted it not a prize, or a thing to be grasped or held to, to be equal with God; but he emptied himself. The thought, then, in brief, is this:-*SITI June 23, 1890, page 359.29*

Christ was equal with God, the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person. He was God. Before him all the hosts of angels, whom he had created (*Colossians 1:16*) bowed in adoration. His glory was the glory of the Father. *John 17:5*. Not a thing was there to mar the perfect peace of heaven, and nothing more could have been conceived to add to the perfect enjoyment of all its inhabitants. But when Christ looked upon the world of men “dead in trespasses and sins,” treasuring up for themselves wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, all this glory seemed to fade away. He did not count it as a thing at all to be desired, so long as men were perishing before his eyes without help. And so he divested himself of all his glory, and submitted to degradation and death, in glory, and submitted to degradation and death, in order that he might win a still greater joy.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.1*

Yes, even the joy of heaven could be increased, and that by removing the Joy of Heaven to earth, that earth’s misery might be turned to joy. Who can estimate the depth of love that could count the immeasurable bliss of heaven as nothing compared with the joy of bringing, through reproach, ignominy and death, fallen men to share it with him? And this is the goodness of God toward men. Ought it not to lead them to repentance? Yea, verily; and such will be its effect upon everyone who will but steadfastly look at it. Oh that men would indeed look to Jesus, not once nor twice, but continually! Of such a look could it with truth be said, “There’s life in a look.”*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.2*

And there is life. What power there is in the thought of God’s love in

Christ, to lift up the soul of the dependent, and to strengthen the weak. Human words cannot give any just conception of this great love, which has healing in it, for the mind cannot grasp it.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.3*

“For the love of God is broader  
Than the measure of man’s mind;  
And the heart of the Eternal  
Is most wonderfully kind.”*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.4*

What, then, “shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?” “Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us.” E. J. W.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.5*

**“The Baptism of Fire” The Signs of the Times, 16, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

From Texas comes the following request: “If you can possibly do so at once, please give me an exposition of the baptism of fire spoken of in Matthew and Luke.”*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.6*

The words of John the Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees among the crowds of Jews assembled on the bank of Jordan were these: “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire; whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” *Matthew 3:11, 12.* The record in the third of Luke is the same.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.7*

We have here two classes of people brought to view,-the wheat and the chaff; and likewise we have two treatments mentioned,-the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the baptism of fire. The two baptisms are as distinct as are the two classes of people. As the question concerns only the baptism of fire, we shall consider that alone.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.8*

It would seem as though the text itself should be sufficient to give a good idea, if not to settle the question, as to what is meant by the baptism of fire. Having stated of Christ that he will baptize with fire, it says that he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. This sets us on the right track; let us see how perfectly the figure fits the final destruction of the wicked. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.9*

In the first place, it must be borne in mind that “baptism” always and everywhere means immersion, and that only. “Baptism” of a whole congregation with a quart of water was a thing unheard of for the first two or three centuries after Christ. John baptized in Ænon near to Salim, “because there was *much water* there.” *John 3:23*. It would not require as much water to “baptize” a thousand people according to the papal perversion of the ordinance, as would suffice to quench the thirst of half a dozen men. Without going further into detailed proof, let it be remembered that whenever a person or thing is said to be baptized in any fluid substance, the person or thing baptized is wholly enveloped in the substance. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.10*

Let the well-known fact also be borne in mind that it is the nature of fire to consume and destroy that which is cast into it. This is its nature, and it will also do so unless the thing is immediately removed after being cast in, or else the fire is quenched before it can begin its devouring work. But if the fire is so great and so fierce as to be unquenchable, then there is no hope of saving anything that it has enveloped. Especially is this so when the substance cast into it is as combustible and as light as chaff, to which the wicked are compared. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.11*

Now read *Revelation 21:8*: “But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.” *Revelation 20:14, 15* also speaks of the “lake of fire.” *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.12*

This lake of fire will be at the time when “the elements shall melt with fervent heat” (*2 Peter 3:10*), and the earth shall be “clean dissolved” by the fire of destruction. See *Isaiah 24:19*. When the

earth is melted with the intensity of the heat, there will be indeed a “lake of fire,” into this the wicked, as chaff, thorns, and worthless branches, will be cast, and burned up. They will literally be immersed in a lake of liquid fire. And this is the “baptism of fire,” for which some earnest but misinformed souls sing and pray. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.13*

Baptism in water is for the remission of sins, and so it is sometimes referred to as washing away sin. See *Acts 22:16*. Consistently with this idea, the baptisms of fire for the purpose of washing away sin; but there is this difference; the baptism by water is for the remission of sin and the salvation of the individual; but the baptism by fire is for the destruction of the sin and of the individual upon whom it is found. It is this that is brought to view in *Isaiah 4:3, 4:-SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.14*

“And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem: When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning.” *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.15*

This is the time when “whomsoever was not found written in the book of life [“written among the living in Jerusalem”] was cast into the lake of fire” (*Revelation 20:15*); the time of the melting of the elements with fervent heat, in the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men (*2 Peter 3:7, 10*), when “the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left.” *Isaiah 24:6.SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.16*

At that time the filth of the daughters of Zion shall be washed away, and the blood of Jerusalem purged with fire. The earth will be cleansed from the curse of sin. Before that time all will be given a chance to wash themselves from sin in the blood of the Lamb; on such the second death-the lake of fire-will have no power. But those who refuse the gracious offer will have to be baptized when the time comes for this to be done, those who have fully identified themselves with sin, and who are permeated with it, will necessarily

be destroyed by the same fire which removes it from the earth.E. J. W.*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.17*

**“The Sabbath-School. Notes on the International Lesson. Height of Mercy”  
The Signs of the Times, 16, 24.**

E. J. Waggoner

**Notes on the International Lesson.  
(June 29.)**

This being the close of the quarter, the choice is given of reviewing or of substituting a lesson on temperance or on missions. The scripture suggested for one of the substituted lessons is *Isaiah 55:8-13*, and on this a few comments will be made. The text reads thus:-*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.18*

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree; and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.”*SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.19*

The text quoted begins with “for,” indicating that it is a conclusion from something preceeding. The sixth and seventh verses contain an exhortation: “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near; let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.” Then

naturally follows the statement, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts," etc. The unrighteous man is to forsake his thoughts, because they are not the thoughts of God. From this we learn the wonderful fact that men must think the thoughts of God, in order to please him. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.20*

What are the thoughts of God? It is evident that we must be able to determine this, to some extent, at least, or else we should not know whether or not to forsake the thoughts that we have, as not being his thoughts. Since the Bible is the word of God, it is plain that it must express his thought. In it we find what he thinks of different actions of men. But that which is most specifically the thought of God is his law, the ten commandments. This is his revealed will, comprehending in itself all that is drawn out in detail in the various books of the Bible. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.21*

The law of God is a law of love. It was given as love. *Deuteronomy 33:2, 3*. The object of it is love. *1 Timothy 1:5*. Love is the fulfilling of it. *Romans 13:10*. The keeping of the commandments is the only complete manifestation of the love of God. *1 John 5:3*. And it is in vain that anybody makes a profession of love to God, while he does not keep his commandments. See *John 14:15; Luke 6:46*. From these Scripture facts we may know that when the apostle Paul says that love "thinketh no evil" (*1 Corinthians 13:5*), he means that perfect obedience to the law of God consists in being free from evil thoughts. This must necessarily follow, because the law of God is the thoughts of God. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.22*

These thoughts are as much higher than the thoughts of the natural man as the heaven is higher than the earth. Therefore when a man fully turns to the Lord, his thoughts must be elevated as much as from earth to heaven. And this one point shows the exceeding greatness of God's law, and how far short of it all men come. Men in their self-righteousness may boast, like the Pharisee, over those whom they regard as great sinners, but their boasting is vain, for, while there are indeed degrees of sin, the difference in the guilt of different men, when compared with that heavenly standard, the law of God, is only as the difference in the height of different trees on earth compared with the distance of earth from the farthest star. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.23*

The statement that as the heavens are high above the earth so are God's thoughts higher than our thoughts, may remind us that the heavens themselves may enable us to think God's thoughts after him. As the law of God is an expression of God's thoughts as to morals, so the material universe is an expression of God's thoughts in concrete form. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork." In them we see what great thoughts God had to mind when he planned the universe. They show his eternal power and godhead, and thus are an aid in lifting our thoughts to the level of God's, in the realm of morals. Surely it is impossible for a person to gaze upon the heavens thoughtfully, and with reverent recognition of their Creator, and at the same time to harbor evil thoughts. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.24*

But there is comfort as well as instruction in the fact that God's thoughts are as much higher than ours as the heavens are higher than the earth. It is in connection with the statement that God will "abundantly pardon" those who turn to him. Now of his thoughts toward us we read: "For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end." *Jeremiah 29:11*. His thoughts toward us are thoughts of peace, and they are as much higher than ours as the heavens are higher than the earth. This agrees with the statement in *Psalms 36:5*: "Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds." Also *Psalms 108:4*: "For thy mercy is great above the heavens; and thy truth reacheth unto the clouds." And *Psalms 103:11*: "For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him." It would be well sometimes if doubting souls could think of their own *good* traits in contrast with those of God. I do not mean for them to think how evil they are, but to rate at a fair value any good qualities they may possess, and then, holding to that valuation, think in how infinitely greater degree those same good qualities exist in God. For instance, take the quality of mercy; let a man think how he would receive one who, having injured him, comes to him with tears in his eyes, making an humble confession, and asking pardon. There are few who would even wait for the penitent one to finish his confession before assuring him of full pardon. His thoughts toward him would be all kindness; but God's thoughts are as much higher than ours as heaven is higher than earth. God is as much more



merciful than man as he is greater. Whoever will institute such a comparison as this, will become ashamed of his own doubts. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.25*

That which should be of special encouragement in the line of missionary effort is the statement that God's word will accomplish that which he pleases, and prosper in the thing whereto he sends it. This does not mean that it will result in the conversion of the whole world. The word of God has been as powerful in every age of the world as it is now, or as it ever will be; yet in no age of the world, not even when the word was incarnate, have even a large minority of people acknowledged God. It is true, however, that even then it accomplished God's purpose. It gathered out of the multitude a people for his name, and left the remainder without excuse. Of one thing we may be sure, that the word will prosper. Therefore consecrated effort to spread abroad a knowledge of the word will not be in vain. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good." *Ecclesiastes 11:6*. It is certain that either this effort or that will prosper, and there is a possibility that both may yield abundant returns. And the few from every age, who have heeded the word of God, will at last form a great multitude whom no man can number, who shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God, when the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, and the whole earth shall resound with the praises of God. E. J. W. *SITI June 23, 1890, page 375.26*

## June 30, 1890

“According to His Deeds. *Romans 1:5, 6*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

“And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; Who will render to every man according to his deeds.” *Romans 2:3-6. SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.27*

The last two verses contain that to which we wish to call special attention, the others are quoted in order that the reader may get the connection. The truth that we wish to impress is very clearly expressed, yet it is very generally ignored. It is this, that they who at the last suffer the pains of the second death get no more than they have been working for, and they alone are responsible for it. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.28*

God takes no pleasure in the death of any. But sin when it is finished bringeth forth death, because sin cannot exist in the presence of the glory of God, and the time will surely come when the glory of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waves cover the sea. For a little moment God has allowed sin to flaunt itself and develop its full measure of hideous deformity, but he will soon blot it from existence; and when sin is destroyed, those who have made sin a part of themselves, and are so permeated with it that it cannot be separated from them, must necessarily go with it. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.29*

But God calls on all men everywhere to repent. To all men comes the proclamation, “Be ye reconciled to God.” To all he says, “Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.” No man can serve God and mammon at the same time. He must choose one or the other. But the freedom and power of choice are given to man, so that he

need not serve Satan unless he wishes to. The service of God leads to life; but “the wages of sin is death.” *Romans 6:23.SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.30*

Now when a man has the choice set before him, and he despises the riches of the goodness and forbearance and long-suffering of God, and deliberately chooses the service of Satan, who can say that when that man dies for his sin he does not get just what he bargained for? He gets simply his wages. Then who can charge God with injustice in punishing the ungodly with everlasting destruction? Whom do we call the unjust man-the one who pays the wages promised? Or the one who withholds them?-The latter of course. Now from the beginning it has been plainly set forth that the wages of sin is death. Paul says that the benighted heathen know that they who commit the crimes of which they are guilty, are worthy of death. Then when a man deliberately chooses that work, the wages of which has been so plainly declared to be death, all must see that to pay the wages promised is the only thing that is consistent with justice. God could not be just and at the same time withhold the wages promised to the worker of iniquity. Many will not admit this now; but at the last day every soul that perishes will acknowledge that it receives but its just due.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.31*

This is perhaps sufficient for this; but how is it with the righteous? Do they likewise get what they earn? The apostle declares that God will render to every man according to his deeds; and Christ himself declares, “Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” *Revelation 22:12*. But while this is so, it must not be forgotten that eternal life is a gift. The reward of the righteous is put in direct contrast with that of the wicked. While the wages of sin is death, the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. It follows, therefore, that no man earns eternal life by his good deeds.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.32*

And yet eternal life is the reward of righteousness. Not of a certain number of righteous deeds, but of righteousness. And how does righteousness come?-Why, it is a gift, for Paul says: “For if by one man’s offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive

abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.” *Romans 5:17*. Now since righteousness itself is a gift, eternal life may be the reward of righteousness, and at the same time be a gift. And thus it is. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.33*

But how about being rewarded “according as his works shall be”? Does not that seem to indicate that individual works come into the account in rendering the reward?-No; not so that the individual works determine the person’s desert. From what do good works come?-From a good heart. Christ says, “A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil.” *Luke 6:45*. Good works are simply the fruit of the Spirit of God, by which righteousness is created in the man. This simply shows that righteousness dwells within. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.34*

One thought more. “It is of the Lord’s mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not.” *Lamentations 3:22*. John the Baptist was called the prophet of the Highest, because he went before the face of the Lord, to prepare his ways, “to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God.” *Luke 1:77, 78*. Thus we learn that it is through the mercy of God that any are saved. But mercy is that quality which treats an offender better than he deserves. No one deserves eternal life; no one can deserve it. After we have done all, we are still unprofitable servants; we have not by our righteousness added anything to the sum of righteousness, so that God should reward us for it. We have only let shine out the righteousness of God which has been given us through the grace of Christ. And so while God gives the sinners the wages which they have earned, and thus displays his strict regard for justice, he gives to the righteous eternal life, according to the righteousness which his mercy has bestowed on them. E. J. W. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.35*

“‘Now’” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent writes concerning the note on *Hebrews 10:38*, "Now the just shall live by faith," in the Sabbath-school lesson for April 26, where it is stated that the word "now" is not an adverb, and has no reference to time. He says: "It seems to me that to take that view of it destroys the connection in which it stands, for the context certainly refers to a time in close connection with the second coming of Christ. While it is impossible for the just to live in any other way, only by faith, it seems to me there is a special sense in which the word 'now' may be rightly used in reference to time." *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.36*

There is no question but that the word "now" may rightly be used with reference to time, for that is a very frequent use of it. But it is also frequently a conjunction. In the case under consideration it is not an adverb, but only a connective particle. Our correspondent says that "to take this view of it," seems to destroy the connection. He does not seem to distinguish between a matter of interpretation and a matter of fact. To say that "now" in *Hebrews 10:38* is not an adverb, is not to take a certain view of the text, but simply to state a fact. We could no more take another view of it than we could take another view of the sun than to say that it shines. To say that the word "live" in the same text is a verb and not an adjective, is not a matter of interpretation, but a fact. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.37*

It must be remembered that the word "now" is not a Greek word. The word which is rendered "now" in this instance is *de*, a conjunctive particle (not participle) which has no reference whatever to time, but is used to introduce an additional thought. The use of the word "now" to introduce a sentence is very common. "Now of the things which we have spoken" (*Hebrews 8:1*); "Now Barabbas was a robber" (*John 18:40*); "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly" (*1 Timothy 4:1*); "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for" (*Hebrews 11:1*); "Now I say" (*Galatians 4:1*); "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples" (*1 Corinthians 10:11*); "Now it was not written for his sake alone" (*Romans 4:23*); "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made" (*Galatians 3:16*). Scores of similar instances might be given. The word is rendered "for" in *Luke 23:17*, and "but" in *1 Corinthians 7:29*, where, as in *Hebrews 10:38*, the coming of Christ is mentioned in close connection. In this latter place it might as well be rendered "but" or

“for” or “nevertheless.” *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.38*

It is impossible to regard “now” in this instance as an adverb of time, without concluding that there is a certain especial time when the just shall live by faith. To say, “Now [at this time] the just shall live by faith,” is to imply that at some previous time they did not live by faith; but that would not be true. It requires no more faith to live a just life at the present time than it did in the days of Moses or Enoch. Abraham had the righteousness of faith; and the highest position to which any Christian can attain, is to “walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham.” This of itself is sufficient to settle the question concerning the force of the word “now,” even though a man knew nothing of grammar. Let us guard against the idea that we are so much better than the ancient worthies; that we have faith and works to a far greater degree than they; for in so doing we charge God with partiality, and run the risk of losing that which we have. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.39*

**“The Righteousness which Is in the Law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend sends us the following question, which we are glad to have the privilege of answering:-*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.40*

“What does the apostle mean by being blameless concerning the righteousness of the law, as we read in *Philippians 3:6*? Is not the righteousness which is in the law the righteousness of God?” *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.41*

The further question implied is, “Was not Paul therefore perfect before he came to Christ?” Let us see if this is what he meant to convey. To do this we will first recall to our minds a few principles concerning the law. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.42*

1. The law of God is righteousness. *Psalms 119:172*. It is the expression of God’s righteousness. *Isaiah 51:6, 7*. It is the expression of his will. *Romans 2:17, 18*. Being the standard of righteousness, anything that is unlike it is sin. *1 John 5:17*. And since it is a transcript of God’s character, the perfect expression of

his most perfect righteousness, it follows that nothing more can be required of a man than perfect obedience to it. *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*. "It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us," said Moses. *Deuteronomy 6:25*. This is self-evident. If we should do the righteousness of God, we should make that righteousness our own. And since nothing more than obedience to the law, or conformity to God's righteousness, can be required of any man, we can readily see that "the doers of the law shall be justified." *Romans 2:13*. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.43*

2. But "there is none righteous, no, not one." *Romans 3:10*. "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." *Verse 12*. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." *Verse 23*. Consequently, all are guilty before God. *Verse 19*. Now a good law cannot justify a wicked man. To justify means to make righteous, or to show that one is already righteous. But a righteous law cannot do this for a wicked man; for if it should say that he had done no wickedness, it would bear false witness, and thus show that it was not good itself; and it cannot take away his sin, so as to make him righteous. Therefore since "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good" (*Romans 7:2*), and since all men have broken the law, it is very evident, as Paul says, that "no man is justified by the law in the sight of God." *Galatians 3:11; Romans 3:20*. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.44*

3. Further; not only has there been no man since the fall who has not broken the law, but there has not been a fallen being who in his natural condition, out of Christ, could by any possibility keep the law. Whoever reflects that the law is the complete expression of God's perfect righteousness, -that it is a statement of his way-, will readily admit this statement; for what fallen man is so presumptuous as to claim that he can of himself do any act that is as good as though God himself had done it? But not to multiply words, we need only quote the positive declaration of Inspiration: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." *Romans 8:7, 8*. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.45*

4. Yet there will be some who will be saved, because, like Enoch, they will have the testimony that they please God. Now how will they do this? How can they stand justified before God? Here is the problem to be solved: The law of God is the standard of righteousness; it is God's righteousness. Whatever does not conform to that standard is sin, and is displeasing to God. None can be counted just except those whose lives conform to it. But there is no one whose life has perfectly conformed to it, and there is no man who can perfectly keep it. And yet there will be some righteous, even as thousands have been. How?*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.46*

5. The answer comes in the words of Paul. "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." *Romans 3:21, 22*. A seeming paradox, yet exceedingly simple when we consider that in Christ dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and that therefore the law, which is the righteousness of God, is the righteousness of Christ. The law came from the Son as well as from the Father, for they are one. But *grace*, as well as truth, came by Jesus Christ. *John 1:17*. By his divine, creative power all things are given to us that pertain to life and godliness. He can and will, in response to our faith in his sacrifice, impart his own righteousness to us. For Paul continues: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." *Romans 3:24, 25*.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.47*

Let us talk familiarly about this for a moment. The law came from Christ as well as from the Father. It is his righteousness. Now the law has only condemnation for us, because we have broken it; but Christ is full of grace, and came into the world not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. Herein is the wonderful, inexplainable love of Christ, that while the righteousness that is in the law is in him, yet while the law condemns sin, he, the originator of righteousness, will justify. So when the law cannot give us righteousness, we turn to Christ and get it; and this



righteousness is such that the law will witness to its genuineness. It cannot be other than the genuine article, for we get it at the same place that the law gets its righteousness. This is righteousness put upon us and created in us.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.48*

6. This is the righteousness which Paul said that he wanted to have when Christ should appear. His anxiety and labor was, "That I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." *Philippians 3:8, 9*. Now we have all the points necessary to an understanding of the sixth verse. Note particularly.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.49*

7. That the apostle says that the righteousness which is of the law, is his own righteousness. But Isaiah declares that "all our righteousnesses are filthy rags" (*Isaiah 64:6*); and that which Paul calls "mine own righteousness" must be the same, for it is that which he did not dare be found having when Christ comes.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.50*

8. Now it was "touching the righteousness which is in the law," or Paul's "own righteousness," that he was blameless. In other words, Paul was blameless from a human standpoint. So far as the natural man could discern, Paul was perfect. With this agree his statements elsewhere concerning himself. He said before Agrippa: "My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." *Acts 26:4, 5*. And again: "I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." *Acts 23:1*. When he, a Pharisee, though, like his brethren, that he could establish his own righteousness by the deeds of the law, he was scrupulous in the performance of duty as far as he understood it. He did no violence to his conscience. So far as any man could see, he kept the law perfectly. As Calvin says: "He was therefore in men's judgment holy, and spotless from all legal blame. A rare praise, and almost singular; yet let us see how much he esteemed it." He counted it loss. Why?-Because God sees not as man sees; man looks upon the outward appearance, but God looks upon the

heart.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.51*

9. Note further that this righteousness which is in the law, touching which Paul said that he was blameless, is one of the things concerning which he says, "Though I might also have confidence in the flesh." *Philippians 3:4*. Ah! The righteousness which is in the law, touching which he was blameless, was simply that righteousness to which the flesh may attain. But by Paul himself it is said that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God;" "because the carnal (fleshly) mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." So then, actually, in its spiritual depth, Paul did not, before he knew Christ, keep the law at all. He was blameless in the eyes of the natural men, by whom spiritual things are not discerned; but compared with the true righteousness of Christ, his righteousness was a dead loss—a minus quantity.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.52*

So we find that while the law is the exponent of perfect righteousness, it has none at all to impart to sinners. The only righteousness that there is in it for an unrenewed man is an empty shell of dead works. Yet when the individual loses confidence in the flesh and its feeble attempts at righteousness, and comes to Christ, who is the source of righteousness, as he is the source of the law, that law will bear witness that the righteousness which is through the faith of Christ, is the genuine righteousness of God. E. J. W.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.53*

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Lawful Work on the Sabbath. *Luke 13:10-17*" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(July 6; *Luke 13:10-17*.)**

The story of the lesson may be told in few words. Jesus was teaching in a synagogue on the Sabbath, and saw a woman in the congregation, who through infirmity was bent so that she was forced to go in a stooping position. For eighteen years she had been thus afflicted. Jesus called her to him, and saying, "Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity," he laid his hands on her, and

immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. This miracle, instead of calling forth praise, only aroused anger in the heart of the ruler, who harshly told the people that if they wanted to be healed, to come on one of the six working-days, and no on the Sabbath. Jesus put his adversaries to shame by pointing out that this was an act of mercy, of far greater importance than the watering of stock, which they themselves would attend to on the Sabbath-day.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.54*

The title of the lesson suggests the statement that Jesus made on another occasion when he had performed a miracle of healing on the Sabbath. Said he, "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days." *Matthew 12:12*. This recognizes a law for the Sabbath, and that law is the fourth commandment. All that Jesus had done was in the direct line of his mission. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." *1 John 3:8*. The binding of the poor woman was one of the works of Satan, and in loosing her, Jesus was destroying Satan's work. It is lawful to undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free on the Sabbath-day.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.55*

Inasmuch as the official lesson notes "the Sunday-sabbath" is made the subject of comment. It must receive attention here, although the lesson does not hint at any question as to which day is the Sabbath. We quote the following from "Peloubet's Select Notes on the International Lessons":-*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.56*

"Sunday is just as really the seventh day and the *Sabbath*-day as is the Saturday-Sabbath of the Jews. All the difference lies in beginning the count from a different point. Bush well says: 'All that the commandment expressly requires is to observe a day of sacred rest after every six days of labor. The seventh day, indeed, is to be kept holy, but not a word is here said as to the point from which the reckoning is to begin. The seventh day is not so much the seventh according to any particular method of computing the septinary cycle, as in reference to the six working-days before mentioned; every seventh day in rotation after six days of labor.'*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.57*

That those who offer this excuse for not keeping the seventh day of

the week do not regard it as valid is shown by the fact that they reject the Saturday-Sabbath. If their theory be true, then they must admit that Saturday is just as much the Sabbath as Sunday. This they will not do. Further, they would accuse a man of being a Sabbath-breaker if he paid no attention to either Sunday or Saturday, even though he rested regularly every Tuesday. This shows that they do not at all believe that the commandment requires simply one day in seven, and that it makes no difference where we begin to count. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.58*

If this theory were true, then it would follow that there is in reality no Sabbath-day; one day of the week would be the Sabbath just as much as any other day. But the commandment is not indefinite. It speaks of "the Sabbath-day," literally, "the day of the Sabbath," and says that "in *it* thou shalt not do any work." Now what day is it in which no secular work is to be done? It is the seventh day that God blessed and sanctified after he had rested upon it. See *Genesis 2:1-3*. *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.59*

Did the Lord rest on one particular day, or not? Of course he did. He could not rest on no day in particular. So there must have been a definite place from which to count. And that all men have always believed that there is a definite place from which to count, is shown by the fact that everywhere, in all countries, and in all ages, they have counted from the same place. Even those who argue that the Sabbath is any seventh day after six days of labor, agree with the rest of mankind in calling the day on which they rest, the first day of the week. How can a day be both the first and the seventh? *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.60*

But the folly of the idea that we can begin to count where we please, and so make the seventh day come just where we want it, and that the commandment warrants this course, may be shown by trying it on something else. Who would claim that if a man has seven sons you could make the first-born the seventh, simply by beginning with the last one and counting backwards? If a question of property were involved, would any court listen for a moment to such nonsense?—No; for no pettifogger would have the audacity to insult the court with so puerile a plea. But men will juggle with divine precepts in a way that would do discredit to the intelligence of a

child.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.61*

The indignation of the ruler is an example of hypocrisy that is very common. It was not because he was so zealous for the Sabbath, for if he had been he would have known that in healing the woman, Jesus was fulfilling the highest design of the Sabbath; but he hated Jesus, and took this means to arouse the prejudices of the people against him. Religious prejudice is easily aroused, and is a bitter thing to have to meet; but, as in this case, it is almost always aroused where the individual has done no wrong. All the religious persecution that has ever disgraced humanity, whether by pagans or professed Christians, has been directed against those who were doing right, but who did not bow to the false standards set up by the persecutors.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.62*

The significance of the miracle of healing the deformed woman should not be overlooked. Jesus was anointed "to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." His miracles were done that men might know that he was the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, they might have life through his name. *John 20:30, 31*. When the woman whom Satan had bound in body for eighteen years was loosed from her infirmity, it was designed as a striking object-lesson, illustrating his power to release men from the bondage of sin, in which Satan has held them for years. His compassion for the woman in her infirmity should cause us to come to him with boldness, because he is touched with the feeling of our spiritual infirmities. E. J. W.*SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.63*

**"A Timely Reminder" The Signs of the Times, 16, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have made a little comment in another item, on the word "now" in *Hebrews 10:38*, showing that the text does not mean that the just shall live by faith at one time more than another. But while this is so, we would not be understood as claiming that there is not special significance in the fact that the statement, "The just shall live by faith," occurs in close connection with the announcement of Christ's

soon coming. The Scripture has foretold that just before the end the attention of the world would be called in an especial manner to the law of God, and to the necessity for observing it intelligently as a whole; and the warning against rejecting the commandment of God is the burden of the message of warning is now being given. Thousands have heeded it, and have acknowledged their obligation to keep the whole law of God. And now comes the great danger, for wherever there is great light there is also great danger. The danger in this case is that those who have seen their error in neglecting important duties, will, like the Jews of old, make their boast in the law, instead of in Christ. Filled with delight at the wondrous beauty of the law, many are led unconsciously to truth in their own works for salvation. The tendency of the human mind is to go to extremes, and in matters of religion Satan is always ready to help them along. When there is a revival on one point, the tendency is to lose sight of everything else. So the apostle reminds us in these days that the just shall live by faith, and not by works. He would not have us forget in our zeal for the law, that the only real obedience is "the obedience of faith." *SITI June 30, 1890, page 375.64*

## July 7, 1890

**“Did Abraham Think that God Would Provide a Lamb?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Christian Union*, Dr. Lyman Abbott, is a strong advocate of the opening of museums, libraries, art galleries, etc., on Sundays. *SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.65*

“Did Abraham think that God would provide a lamb instead of Isaac?” is a question that comes to us for answer. We read in *Hebrews 11:17-19* that Abraham offered Isaac, through faith in God, “accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead.” If Abraham had expected that God was going to provide a substitute, there would have been no occasion for faith in the resurrection, and the matter would have been no trial at all. *SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.66*

A clergyman of the Church of England, Joseph Leycester Lyne, popularly known as “Father Ignatius,” is now in this country lecturing and preaching to raise funds for the Abbey of St. Anthony, in Wales, where he has organized a community of Benedictine monks. The rules of the order are the same as those followed at similar Roman Catholic institutions. Mr. Lyne has gathered a number of clergymen who are infatuated with a monastic life. *SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.67*

Elsewhere in this paper we have written briefly on the subject of eternal life, showing that it can be obtained only in Christ, and that to deny that life comes only through Christ is virtually to deny Christ. Now it is doubtless a fact that the most of the professed Christians who believe that all men, whether good or bad, will exist throughout eternity, imagine that they do believe in life through Christ, because they confound life with happiness. They hold that only believers in Christ will have eternal happiness, and that unbelievers will be doomed to eternal misery, and they call the first state eternal life, and the second state eternal death. But in considering this subject it should not be forgotten that life and death are distinctly opposite

conditions. As long as a man has breath he is alive, no matter how miserable he may be. People who are suffering intense agony, sometimes pray for death to relieve them of their sufferings. Nobody considers them dead because they are in misery. So if the wicked were to be drowned to an eternity of conscious suffering, they would have eternal life just as surely as would the righteous in glory. Let the terms "life" and "death" be taken in their simple, obvious meaning, and the doctrine of immortality as revealed in the Bible may very easily be understood.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.68*

At the recent Convention of the New York State Sunday-school Association, Dr. John Hall delivered an address on "The Old Testament Enfolded the New," in which he said that it is simply calumny to say that God is represented in any other light in the Old Testament from what he is described in the New; and he closed with this exhortation:-*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.69*

"Put before your pupils the union, completeness, and beauty of the Old and the New, and you will be magnifying Christ. That is the only thing you need to do. If you magnify Christ, he will draw all men unto him."*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.70*

We are glad to see the attention of people directed to the entire Bible instead of to fragments of it. It is all profitable.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.71*

**"Seek for Immortality" The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

"To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, [God will render] eternal life." *Romans 2:7*.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.72*

From this verse we conclude that the sum of glory and honor and immortality is contained in eternal life, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Romans 6:23*. It also furnishes the most complete refutation of the idea made so popular by Plato and Addison, that men are by nature endowed with immortality, because there is so universal a longing for it. The apostle asks in one place,



“What a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?” and with far greater force might it be asked, What a man hath, why doth he yet long for? and with still greater force, What a man hath, why is he exhorted to seek for?*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.73*

Let us note the occurrence of the word “immortality” in the Bible. It will not take long, for it occurs only five times, yet they take us by regular steps through the whole subject. First, we read in *1 Timothy 6:15, 16* that the “blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords,” is the one “who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see.” He has “life in himself,” and can bestow it on whomsoever he will.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.74*

The contrast between God and man is clearly brought out in *Romans 1:23*, where we are told that the heathen “changed the glory of the uncorruptible [or immortal] God into an image made like to corruptible [or mortal] man.” God is immortal; man is mortal, and he is therefore exhorted to seek for immortality, that he may dwell with God.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.75*

But where shall we seek for immortality? Shall we look to writings of the ancient heathen? Of what use would that be? “The world by wisdom knew not God,” and how then could they know anything of immortality, which belongs to God alone? The word of God alone can direct us in our search, and it declares that the purpose and grace of God in Christ “is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” *2 Timothy 1:10*. The gospel, then, is the place where we are to seek for immortality. There alone is it revealed; there alone can it be found.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.76*

Having found where immortality is revealed, how are we to make it ours? The Scriptures are very definite on this point. Thus we read: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” *John 3:36*. The beloved disciple declares of Christ, that “in him was life.” He was “full of grace [favor] and truth;” and the psalmist tells us that in the favor of God there is life (*Psalms 30:5*);

therefore he who has Christ has the favor of God, and life from him.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.77*

That life comes from God, and that no man can have it except by the grace of Christ, is shown very clearly. Said Jesus: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." *John 10:10*. From this, with the statement in *Acts 17:28*, "for in him we live, and move, and have our being," we learn that we depend upon Christ, not alone for immortal life, but for this present existence. When Adam fell he brought the race of mankind under the sentence of eternal death, and it was only through the grace of God in Christ that a second probation was granted. So while the saints will throughout eternity offer praises to Christ for bestowing immortality upon them, all men owe thanks to him for giving them this little span of life, in which to seek for immortality.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 375.78*

Jesus reproved the Jews for inconsistency, in that, while they searched the Scriptures, because in them eternal life was to be found, and those Scriptures testified of him as the way of life, yet they would not come to him that they might have life. *John 5:39, 40*. Now if life could have been obtained in any other way than through Christ, the Jews might have retorted, "We don't need to come to you that we may have life, for we have it without you." This is what they, in effect, did; and it is what thousands are actually saying to-day. It is the language of Spiritualism. Believing that men are by nature endowed with immortality, Spiritualists scornfully reject Christ as the way of life. The inevitable tendency of the doctrine of the natural immortality of man, is to lead men to lightly esteem Christ.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.1*

Read one more testimony. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." *1 John 5:10-12*. It is a terrible thing to deny that life can be obtained only in Christ, for to do so is to charge God with lying, since that is the record that he has given. Let God be true, even though every man be proved a liar.*SITI July*

Note that while eternal life belongs to everyone who has Christ, no one is yet in full possession of it. God has given to us eternal life, but this life is in his Son. Not only is it to be found in him, but for a little space it remains in him, for safe keeping. Paul says to Christians: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." *Colossians 3:3, 4*. Eternal life is ours now, if we have Christ, just as surely as it ever will be; but Christ keeps it in his own charge. When will it be ours by actual possession? This brings us to the summing up, which we read as follows:-*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.3*

"Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." *1 Corinthians 15:51-54*.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.4*

Now let us review briefly. All men are by nature mortal, corruptible; God only has immortality. If we would have immortality, we must seek for it. It is to be found only in the gospel of Jesus Christ. He who does not seek Christ, will know nothing of immortality. Outside of Christ there is no life. For a little season we have, by the mercy of God, existence granted to us, that we may seek life. As long as God's mercy is extended to men, good and bad alike may live; but when Christ shall say to those who reject him, "Depart from me," they will be cut off from the Source of life, and will suffer eternal death. But to those who have accepted Christ, the gift of immortality will be bestowed at his appearing.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.5*

How is it possible that men who profess to love our Lord Jesus Christ, can dishonor him by ignoring him as the giver of life? E. J. W.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.6*

**“Is It Civil?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The latest utterance of the chief worker in behalf of Sunday legislation is the following:-*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.7*

“Laws setting apart a weekly ‘Independence-day’ are no more inconsistent with liberty and much more essential to it than the law of the annual Independence-day.”*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.8*

The man who expects that people are going to accept such a feeble comparison, as that as sound argument for Sunday legislation, pays a poor compliment to their intelligence. There is no more likeness between the Sunday observance that is contemplated by the proposed laws and the observance of the Fourth of July, than there is between a Presbyterian synod and a college base-ball nine. When such a plea as that is made for Sunday laws, all you have to do is to ask if under the proposed Sunday laws it is designed to give people the same freedom of action that they have on the Fourth of July. Are we to believe that all the so-called American Sabbath Union is working for is for a law granting the people full liberty to take “a day off” every Sunday, to go on a picnic, let off fire-crackers, lounge around, and do as they please generally? Some less gauzy plea will have to be invented.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.9*

**“The Only Example” The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following question and answer we clip from the *Christian Advocate*:-*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.10*

“*Question*-Is it wrong for a professed Christian to read Shakespeare’s plays?*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.11*

“*Answer*-Wesley read them.”*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.12*

We do not quote this question and answer for the purpose of making any comment upon Shakespeare’s plays, or upon the fact that Wesley read them, or to say whether or not any Christian

should now read them. What we wish to note is the form of the answer,—"Wesley read them." We honor Wesley as a man of God, but the fact that he did a certain thing is no reason whatever why somebody else should do it. If it is right for Christians to do any given thing, it is not because some good man has done the same thing. If the thing is right, the Christian of to-day may do it for the same reason that the old-time Christian did it, but not because he did it.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.13*

There is not a man that ever lived on this earth, save "the Man Christ Jesus," whose example in any given thing may be taken as a reason why others may do the same thing. No matter how good the man was, he who refers to him as authority for any practice, is in a dangerous condition. Christ suffered for us, "leaving us an example, that ye should follow in his steps;" but he is the only example.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.14*

This is the reason why it is so dangerous a thing to take any man, however good, as a model either of faith or practice: There is no man who is infallible; so long as his course is exactly correct, his follower *may not* go astray; but he is liable to err, and then the poor fellow, who has substituted another's judgment for his own, is sure to go wrong. To follow any man in belief or practice is to invest that man with infallibility, and to blindly copy his mistakes as well as his perfect deeds. The result will be a poor imitation of his goodness, and an exaggeration of his frailties.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.15*

It is no discredit to anybody to say that he is not authority in matters of doctrine, nor an example in the realm of duty. God's word alone is the standard of truth, for it is the truth, and it unfolds its treasures to the humblest as well as to the great. Whoever has a determination to do God's will shall know the doctrine. And he who follows a good practice *because* some good man has done the deed, really worships the man, instead of God. Even though the man never made a mistake, his imitator would fall far short of attaining to his goodness, because God is the only one whose worship can elevate. Hero-worship is simply attempted imitation; but he who worships God alone, worships one who is not simply an example, but who lifts the worshiper to his own level.*SITI July 7,*

1890, page 402.16

Therefore, “be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven.”*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.17*

**“Positive Testimony” The Signs of the Times, 16, 26.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent* and the *Congregationalist* have had a little friendly dispute in regard to women taking part in meeting. Both assume that the apostle Paul positively condemned everything of the kind, forgetting that his statement, “Let your women keep silence,” etc., is to be read in connection with his directions as to how they shall appear when praying or prophesying in meeting. But assuming that Paul absolutely forbids women to speak in meeting under any circumstances, the *Congregationalist* says that to disregard the injunction is to impair the revelation of which it is a part. But the *Independent* retorts as follows:-*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.18*

“Hardly so. ‘In six days the Lord made heaven and earth;’ that is quite as definite as what Paul said. And when it comes to the Sabbath, there is not only the injunction for the seventh day, as definite as words can make it, but reason given also, in the ordination of the week and the Sabbath as a memorial of creation, as definite as any reason given by Paul for the subjection of women. And yet the whole church has given it up, with no repeal and no history of the change, simply because time and conditions had altered.”*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.19*

But the conditions have not changed. It is still a fact that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested upon and blessed and sanctified the seventh day, and the seventh day is still the only memorial of creation, and it is just as important to remember God’s power now as it ever was. The commandment is unrepealed, and is as definite as it ever was. Only the people have changed.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.20*

E. J. Waggoner

It is reported that Edwin Arnold, author of “The Light of Asia,” is now engaged on a poem to be entitled “The Light of the World,” having for its subject the character and history of Christ. It is said that “the view of Christ’s person is that he was not God, but a perfect man, a link between God and man.” To be sure, Edwin Arnold is not a professed Christian; but his worldly wisdom ought to teach him that nothing can be a link between two objects, unless it actually touches both of those objects. So it is utterly impossible for Christ to be a link between God and man, unless he is both God and man. If he lacked but a hair’s breadth of perfect divinity, then he could not have power to make men partakers of the divine nature; and if by the same amount he failed to come down to the level of man, we could not get hold of him. But he does indeed form a perfect link between God and man, because, having by nature the attributes of divinity, he took upon himself the likeness of men. And, by the way, if Christ were not God, then he could not be a perfect man; for he testified of himself that he is God, and perfect men do not bear false witness. And further if Christ were only a perfect man, and not God, how can the fact be accounted for that never before or since his life on earth has there been a perfect man? Why hasn’t some other man made his way perfect? People may utter all the sentiment they please about the perfection of Christ’s character as a man, but it all amounts to nothing if he is not also acknowledged to be God.*SITI July 7, 1890, page 402.21*

## July 14, 1890

“The Indwelling Word” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

In the sixteenth verse of the third chapter of Colossians occurs this exhortation: “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom.” This text, rightly understood, solves the problem of Christian living. Let us, therefore, spend a few moments to see how much is involved in it. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 402.22*

That there is a power in the word of God, far above that of any other book, cannot be doubted. The Lord through the prophet Jeremiah rebukes the false prophets, who speak their own words instead of the words of God, and says: “What is the chaff to the wheat?” “Is not my word like as a fire? Saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?” *Jeremiah 23:28, 29*. And the same prophet thus relates his experience when he was reproached because of the word of the Lord: “Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay.” *Jeremiah 20:9. SITI July 14, 1890, page 402.23*

The word hidden in the heart protects against sin. “Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee.” *Psalms 119:11*. And of the righteous we read that the reason why none of his steps slide, is that “the law of his God is in his heart.” *Psalms 37:31*. David also says: “Concerning the works of men, by the word of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer.” *Psalms 17:4*. Jesus, also, in his memorable prayer for his disciples, said, “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.” *John 17:17. SITI July 14, 1890, page 402.24*

The word of the Lord is the seed by which the sinner is born again. We read of the “Father of lights” that “of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures.” *James 1:18*. And the Apostle Peter says: “Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto



unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." *1 Peter 1:22, 23*. So we learn that, while those who are Christ's are born of the Spirit, the word of God is the seed from which they are developed into new creatures in Christ. The word, then, has power to give life. It is itself "quick," that is, alive, and powerful; and the psalmist prays to be quickened, made alive, according to the word, and then says: "This is my comfort in my affliction; for thy word hath quickened me." *Psalms 119:25, 50. SITI July 14, 1890, page 402.25*

This is stated very plainly by Jesus himself in *John 6:63*: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." This shows that the power of the Spirit of God dwells in the word of God. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 402.26*

With the knowledge that the word of God is the seed by which men are begotten unto a new life, and that the hiding of the word in the heart keeps one from sin, we may easily understand *1 John 3:9*: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." How simple! There is in the word that divine energy which can transform the mind, and make a new man, "which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Of course the word can do this only for those who receive it in simple faith. But the word does not lose any of its power. If the soul thus born again retains that sacred, powerful word by which he was begotten, it will keep him still a new creature. It is as powerful to preserve as it is to create. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 402.27*

Jesus, our great Example, gave us an illustration of this. When tempted on every point by the devil, his sole reply was, "It is written," followed by a text of Scripture that met the case exactly. The Christian who would stand fast must do the same thing. There is no other way. This is an illustration of David's words, "By the word of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer." *SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.1*

It is this of which we read in *Revelation 12:11*, where, in speaking of the casting down of the “accuser of our brethren,” the heavenly voice says: “And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony.” This does not mean, as some have carelessly assumed, the word of their testimony in meeting, but the word of the testimony in which the psalmist found so great delight. They overcame Satan by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of God.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.2*

But this cannot be done except by those who have the word of God abiding in them. The Spirit is given to bring truth to remembrance, in time of trial; but that which one has not learned he cannot remember. But if he has hidden the word in his heart, the Spirit will, in the hour of temptation, bring to his remembrance just that portion which will foil the tempter.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.3*

Every Christian can testify as to the power of the word at such times. When inclined to congratulate himself on some real or fancied superior attainment, what a powerful check are the words, “Who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?” *1 Corinthians 4:7*. Or when harsh and bitter thoughts are struggling within him for control, what power to quell those turbulent emotions lies in the words, “Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil.” *1 Corinthians 13:4, 5*. When provoked almost beyond endurance, how the gentle rebuke, “The servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men,” helps one to be calm. Add to this the many “exceeding great and precious promises” which bring victory to every soul that grasps them by faith. Thousands of aged Christians can testify to the miraculous power resting in a few simple words of the Scriptures.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.4*

Now whence comes this power? The answer is found in the words of Christ: “The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.” What spirit are they? The apostle Peter, speaking of the prophets, says that it was the Spirit of Christ that was in them. So, as we said before, the power of the Spirit dwells in the word.

Yea, Christ himself dwells in the word, for he is the Word.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.5*

Who can understand the mystery of inspiration?-He who can understand the mystery of the incarnation; for both are the same. "The Word was made flesh." We cannot understand how Christ could be all the fullness of the Godhead, and at the same time be in the form of a servant, subject to all the infirmities of mortal flesh. Neither can we understand how the Bible could be written by fallible mortals, exhibiting the peculiarities of each, and yet be the pure, unadulterated word of God. But it is certainly true that the power that was in the Word that was made flesh, is the power that is in the word that the apostles and prophets have written for us.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.6*

Now we can begin to appreciate more the power residing in the word. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." *Psalm 33:6*. Christ, by whom the worlds were made, upholds them "by the word of his power." *Hebrews 1:3*. The power that resides in the words of revelation, is the power that could speak the worlds into existence, and can keep them in their appointed places. Surely, then, it is worth our while to take time to study and meditate upon the word.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.7*

It is by so doing that we bring Christ himself into our hearts. In the fifteenth chapter of John, the Lord exhorts us to abide in him, and to allow him to abide in us; and then a few verses later he speaks of our abiding in him, and his word abiding in us. *John 15:4, 7*. It is by his word that Christ does abide in the heart; for Paul says that Christ will dwell in the heart by faith (*Ephesians 3:17*); and "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." *Romans 10:17*.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.8*

Many people earnestly long for Christ to come and dwell in their hearts, and they imagine that the reason why he does not do so is because they are not good enough, and they vainly set about trying to get so good that he can condescend to come in. They forget that Christ comes into the heart, not because it is free from sin, but in order to free it from sin; and they possibly never realized that Christ

is in the word, and that he who will make it a constant companion, and will yield himself to its influence, will have Christ dwelling within. He who has hidden the word in his heart, who meditates in it day and night, and who believes it with the simple faith of childhood,- such a one has Christ dwelling in his heart by faith, and will experience his mighty, creative power. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.9*

Is there not something inspiring in this thought? When we come to God in secret prayer, and the Spirit brings to our remembrance some precious promise or needed reproof, is it not encouraging to know that as we accept them, Christ is coming into the heart with the same power that brought the worlds from nothing? Does it not clothe the word with new dignity? No wonder David could never tire of sounding its praises. May the thought that God is in the word be a fresh incentive to all to gain time and strength for their work by taking from it more time to feed upon the source of divine strength. E. J. W. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.10*

**“The Advantage of the Jew” The Signs of the Times, 16, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

The great apostle to the Gentiles, in answer to the question, What advantage hath the Jew? replied, “Much in every way; chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.” *Romans 3:2*. It will be noted that he does not say that their advantage lay in knowing the law, but in having the law committed or intrusted to them. That the law has to do with all the world, and not with the Jews alone, is shown by *Romans 3:19*, where the apostle states that the law, speaking to those within its sphere, over whom it has jurisdiction, stops every mouth and makes all the world stand guilty before God. If all are guilty, then all have the law, “for where no law is there is no transgression.” Paul tells us, also, that Christ was “made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.” *Galatians 4:4, 5*. But Christ died for all (*2 Corinthians 5:14, 15*); therefore all men are by nature under the law, and, of course, subject to it. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.11*

The special advantage of the Jew, then, lay not in the fact that God

made known his law to them, but that unto them it was *committed*. To them was given the honor of transmitting it to the other nations. They were chosen as the missionary people. They were to be “workers together with God” in enlightening the world.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.12*

God is no respecter of persons. As he sends rain on the just and on the unjust, and causes his sun to shine upon the evil and the good, so the light of his law shines for all. He makes no revelation of himself for the special benefit of any one class of people. The light which he has for one, he is anxious that all should share to an equal extent. So when he gives great light to any people, it is that they may carry it to others.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.13*

It is no small honor thus to be associated with God in laboring for the welfare of mankind. When a people has been intrusted with great light, and have selfishly shut it up to themselves, imagining that the light was given them because God thought so much of *them*, they miss the opportunity of their lives. Not only do they fail of the high position which God was willing that they should occupy, as light-bearers, but they lose the light that they have.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.14*

God designs that the people shall be the light of the world. See *Matthew 5:14*. Now it is evident that when he gives great light to any people, that they may impart it to others, he will give them every possible facility for spreading that light. Thus it was with the Jewish nation. When, according to his promise to the Fathers, he delivered Israel from Egypt, he did so in a most wonderful manner. His judgments upon the Egyptians, the dividing of the Red Sea, the miraculous preservation of Israel in the desert, the earthquake at the giving of the law, the victories which he gave them over their enemies, the miraculous passage of the Jordan, and many other things, all combined to give them the greatest prestige among the nations. Their uniform prosperity could not fail to make them feared and respected.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 410.15*

Moreover, the law itself, as long as they kept it, would raise them greatly in the estimation of the surrounding nations. To them Moses said: “Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as

the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.” *Deuteronomy 4:5, 6.SITI July 14, 1890, page 411.1*

What a wonderful opportunity they had to do missionary work. God was with them, so that the fear of them and the dread of them was on all nations. No people would dare attack them; they would be safe from molestation in any country. Added to this was the wholesome respect which the people felt for their knowledge of the law. Everything was made ready for them, so that it would not have taken them long to carry to all the nations of earth the gospel which had been preached to them. No such advantages have ever been given to any other people. Well did the psalmist say, “He hath not dealt so with any nation.” *Psalm 147:20.SITI July 14, 1890, page 411.2*

The scope of the Sabbath-school lesson for July 26, which these reflections are designed to accompany, does not allow us to dwell on the way in which the Jews abused their glorious opportunities until their light finally went out in darkness. Let us at this time learn this one lesson, that when God gives us blessings, it is not in order that we may selfishly enjoy them, but that by means of them we may be better qualified to labor for him. Whatever advantages he gives his people, are the means by which they are to lift their light from obscurity to the place where it may be seen by all. If they then fail to do the work for which they have been elevated, the result can readily be imagined. E. J. W.*SITI July 14, 1890, page 411.3*

**“Taking Up the Cross. *Luke 11:23-25*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

**Notes on the International Lesson.  
(July 20, *Luke 11:23-25*.)**

“And he turned, and said unto them, If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and

brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.” The Saviour had just spoken a parable which showed the gracious invitation that God extends to all, and now, in order that none who accept it may have occasion to say afterwards that they were deceived, he tells them plainly the conditions required of everyone who follows him. The Lord does not want anybody to follow him blindly. He would have them know all that is involved before they begin; in that case, they will not be as likely to give up in discouragement. He conceals nothing of the hardness of the way, but rather sets that forth as an inducement. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 411.4*

It is very natural to look upon laws that are unfavorable to the free exercise of religion, as a real hindrance to religion. Persecution is looked upon as a calamity to the church. Now while nobody should court persecution, yet it is by no means certain that it is the greatest calamity the church can suffer in this world. It is true that when these unfriendly laws are repealed, it is easier to induce people to identify themselves with the cause of God; but it is not true that more real strength is added to the church by the many who join in times of peace than by the few who unite in the face of persecution. Those who accept God’s truth, knowing that it will involve persecution and loss of friends and property, will not become frightened when those things come. But those of whom it is said that they would accept the truth if they could see their way clear to do so, are the ones who, if the way were cleared so that they could join, would fall back as soon as the way should again become obstructed. It should not be forgotten that the church’s brightest period was when the whole pagan world was against it. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 412.1*

This brings us the statement that men often make when some practical truth is presented to them, that they “could not make a living” if they obeyed it. They seem blind to the fact that thousands have obeyed it under more trying circumstances, and have not failed to make a living. But suppose they could not; that does not make any difference. Christ calls us to obtain the future immortal life, and if this has to be lost in order to gain that, it is only giving up a small thing for something infinitely greater. “He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake,” said Christ,

“shall find it.” *Matthew 10:39*. Thus it appears that in reality the only prospect one has of making a living is by obeying Christ. “Salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ,” come to those who “loved not their lives unto the death.” *Revelation 12:10, 11*.SITI July 14, 1890, page 412.2

*Verse 26* must be read in the light of *verse 33*, and other texts. When it is said that a man cannot be a disciple of Christ, if he does not hate father, mother, wife, children, life, etc., it means that he must hold them all as secondary to the cause of God. That the word “hate” does not in this passage mean animosity and malice, may be learned from the fact that “love is the fulfilling of the law” (*Romans 13:10*), and that it “worketh no ill to his neighbor;” and that we are commanded to put away all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and evil speaking and all malice. Also from the fact that the apostle Paul gives express injunctions to husbands to love their wives even as Christ loved the church. *Ephesians 5:25*. The commandment, “Honor thy father and thy mother,” would forbid feelings of enmity against them. Therefore we are to understand that Christ means that nothing is to be so loved as to shut out love for him. He is to occupy the first place. This will often bring one into direct antagonism with his dearest friends, as stated in *Matthew 10:35, 36*. And sometimes he will be brought where he will have to reject even his own life. Not that he loves life and friends less, but that he loves Christ more.SITI July 14, 1890, page 412.3

This, then, is the cost of the kingdom of God. Christ does not secure any followers on false pretenses. He sets before them all the difficulties, as in *Mark 10:29, 30*, as well as the grand result, and then asks each one to deliberately calculate whether or not he can undertake it. He who does not count the cost is liable to be put to shame. Happy is the man who, when he sits down to reckon, has his vision so clear that he can view things in their proper relation, approving the things that are more excellent, so that he may know that one moment of heaven will outweigh all that he can suffer on earth. In comparison with the “far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory” (*2 Corinthians 4:17*), the afflictions that now may be suffered are light. Indeed, the apostle Paul, who had opportunities for accurate calculation, such as no other man ever had, reckoned that “the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be



compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." *Romans*  
8:18. *SITI July 14, 1890, page 412.4*

## July 21, 1890

“Front Page” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the Nashville *Christian Advocate* is a very apt criticism on a very common expression: “Neither in church life nor individual experience is there any such thing as ‘holding our own;’ this is the law of death; grave-yards hold their own.” *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.5*

“Evidences of Christianity!” exclaims Coleridge; “I am weary of the word. Make a man feel the want of it, ...and you may safely trust it to its own evidence.” A truer thing was never spoken. Not all the logical treatises ever written can turn a skeptic from dead works to serve the living God; but when the soul grows weary with its burden of sin, and hears the voice of Jesus saying, “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest,” he knows that Christianity is true. “He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself.” *1 John 5:10. SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.6*

An article in the *Lutheran Observer*, defending the Augsburg Confession from the charge of teaching infant damnation, closes thus:—*SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.7*

“The Lutheran way of stating it is easy enough. It is about as follows: Since the children, without any knowledge or choice of their own, come under all that sin has brought, so without their own will and choice may they come into all that Christ has wrought for the world. The sign and seal of all this is baptism. But we are not authorized to say that because the ordinance in any case is absent, therefore the blessings of Christ are wanting. Hence, we erect it into a doctrine for the universal church, that all children, baptized or unbaptized, pagan or Christian, are saved, or, as the revised Westminster Confession will have it, are of the number of the *elect*.” *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.8*

And now it rests with them to explain the significance of infant “baptism.” How can it be a sign that the infants are given the benefit

of all that Christ wrought for the world, when it is allowed that unbaptized infants share the same? Nothing could show more fully than the above paragraph does the fact that so-called infant baptism is an absurd practice, no foundation whatever in either reason or revelation. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.9*

“That the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved Me.” This is one clause of our Saviour’s prayer to the Father, just before his betrayal. What a precious truth it teaches! That God loves us just as he loves his only begotten Son. Is it difficult to believe this? We have only to remember that “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” If he had loved us less than he loved the Son, he would not have given the Son for our redemption. Why did he so love us? He answers: “I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake.” And what will his love accomplish for us? Again he says: “I will make a man more precious than fine gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ohpir.” *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.10*

**“Sinning Without Law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

“For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law (For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.); in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” *Romans 2:11-16. SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.11*

The first part of this passage is a conclusion of what has gone before, as well as an introduction to what follows. God will render to every man according to his deeds, whether he be Jew or Gentile,

because there is no respect of persons with him. The fact that a man was a Jew by birth did not commend him to the favor of God, over the Gentile who was equally good. Every soul of man that doeth evil will receive punishment therefor, no matter what his nationality or profession. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.12*

But right here comes in the implied question, How can God do thus, and still be just? There are such varying degrees of light and knowledge that it would seem that the ignorance of some ought to shield them from punishment. The apostle has anticipated this in the beginning, by showing that the heathen are without excuse, since they have through the things that God has made, enough light to guide them aright; nevertheless, he proceeds to explain further. There will be degrees of punishment: those who have sinned without law, shall perish without law; and those who have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law. When?—"In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," in accordance with the gospel which Paul was commissioned to announce. The difference between sinning without law and sinning in the law is that which will now claim our attention. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.13*

A very slight examination suffices to show that *verses 12 and 16* are to be read in connection, and that *verses 13-15* are parenthetical. They are thrown in as an explanation of *verse 12*. A right understanding of them will cause God's justice, and the universality of the law, to stand out clearly. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.14*

In the first place, let it be remembered that only those who have sinned are to be punished. God doesn't punish men for ignorance, but for sin; and "sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. Therefore "every soul of man" who in the judgment shall be made to suffer punishment, will be one who has transgressed the law of God, and that knowingly. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.15*

How can this be? it is asked, when in this very connection the apostle speaks of those who have "sinned without law." *Verse 14 and 15* answer this perfectly. Let us read them again:-*SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.16*

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the

things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.” *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.17*

Go where you will, it is impossible to get outside the sphere of the law. Even the Gentiles, who “sin without law,” are judged guilty by that same law written in their hearts. And so it appears that they are not actually without law, after all. All the law that they are without is the written law; but they have in their hearts a copy of that law, which, although not by any means so complete and perfect as the written law, is yet sufficient to either acquit or condemn them in the judgment, according as they have obeyed or violated it. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.18*

We have, in a previous article, referred to the enmity which, immediately after the fall, God implanted in the heart of men against Satan. Now since enmity against God is hatred of his law, it follows that enmity against Satan must be love for that law; for Satan is in every respect opposed to God. The putting of this enmity into the heart of man was an act of grace on the part of God; nevertheless, it is correct to say that man has this by nature, since God made it to be a part of his nature. It is the light wherewith Christ lights every man that comes into the world. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 412.19*

We see, then, that men are not born into this world totally depraved. They have some knowledge of right and wrong, and some promptings to do right. They may obliterate this knowledge and these promptings by their own evil course, if they will; or, yielding to the good impulse, they may grow in knowledge. It is this knowledge that men have, by which the Holy Spirit produces conviction of sin. It is only when the Spirit has been resisted till sin has completely darkened the soul, and the mind is wholly void of judgment, that the Spirit ceases to strive with man, because there is nothing left by which it can produce conviction. Then the conscience has become seared as with a hot iron, and the sinner is beyond hope. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.1*

Now it matters not how little a heathen may know as to what is right

and what is wrong, it is evident that if he knows only one thing, that one item is sufficient to condemn him, if he disregards it. If a man who has a little knowledge of the righteousness which the law requires, ignores that little, that is proof that he would treat the whole law in the same way, if he had it. It is not necessary, therefore, to try him by the whole law, in all its exceeding breadth. He is judged by just that which he has. In the judgment, according to the text under consideration, he will not be confronted by the whole law, which he has never seen, but he will be brought face to face with himself. He will be confronted by the things which he knew that he ought to do, and did not do; and it can be said to him as well as to the sinner who lived in the full blaze of the gospel, "Ye knew your duty, but ye did it not." *SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.2*

Thus the heathen who has never seen the law will "perish without law;" but since there is nothing that a man ought to do, which is not commanded by the law ("Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." *Ecclesiastes 12:13*), it remains a truth that it is by the law, in reality, that every work and every secret thing are brought into judgment. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.3*

Of course there is no difficulty about those who, sinning in the law, are judged by the law. They are those who, having the whole law revealed to them, disregard it, and are judged by the whole law. The only thing in this passage that ever troubles anybody, is the matter of sinning without law; but we have seen that this gives us warrant for claiming that there is sin which is not taken account of by the law, or that any are outside the jurisdiction of the law of God. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.4*

It is worth bearing in mind, also, that the light which is sufficient to condemn man, is sufficient, also, to save him, if it is followed. If the man who has but a little knowledge of right and wrong, will but walk in the light that he has, he will be justified. To him more light will be given, for "light is sown for the righteous." "If any man willeth to do his will he shall know of the teaching." *John 7:17*, Revised Version. And thus is seen the justice of God's dealings with man. E. J. W. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.5*

**"Pleading for Persecution" The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Lutheran Observer* refers to Dr. Hickok as “the highest authority in political economy and moral science,” and quotes from his “Moral Science” with reference to religion in the State. Following is a portion of the citation:-*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.6*

“A State has, and ever must have, some form of religious faith. It must use religion and appeals to conscience, and apply the doctrine of future retribution in some way, or it cannot attain its end in the conservation of the public freedom; and this necessity for religious forms will make it necessary that it recognize some articles of faith. It must have its own binding oaths, and holy days, and sacred books.... The only course for any individuals who may dissent from such religious faith, is to follow each the honest dictates of his own conscience, and subject himself to such retributions as the State in its judgment deems necessary for its own ends of freedom. All regard for honest differences of conscience should be scrupulously exhibited as far as may be; yet, with a single eye to public liberty, it may be necessary that the State should sometimes determine against individual conscience; and in all such cases, while the individual should preserve his own conscience in its integrity at any hazard, he must still quietly yield to the penalty which the State, in its honest regard for public freedom imposes.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.7*

“A theistic nation may thus incorporate into its national education the religious acknowledgment of a personal God; a Christian nation may use the Gospels as a text-book; a Protestant nation may use the Protestant Bible in the public schools.”*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.8*

By the same token, a Catholic nation may use the Catholic Bible in the public schools, and the Protestant minority must say nothing, or suffer for conscience’ sake. There is no question but that the Catholic nation would ignore the convictions of Protestants; but it does seem inconsistent for a professed Protestant to uphold it in such a course.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.9*

The same line of reasoning that Dr. Hickok uses would uphold all the barbarities practiced by Turks upon Chinese. The government

must have some form of faith; that form must of course be the will of the majority; if the majority are Mohammedans or pagans, then the Christians whose conscience will not allow them to practice the prevailing religion, must suffer. The man who advocates State religion, thereby pleads for religious persecution, and justifies the martyrdom of Stephen, James, and Paul, the burning of Huss, and every other murder that has been perpetrated in the name of religion. It is very easy to talk about other people suffering for their convictions, but few stop to think that it means simply martyrdom.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.10*

In such a discussion as this it should not be forgotten that the United States is no more a Protestant nation than it is a Catholic nation. This country is not yet a church organization, notwithstanding the efforts to make it such.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.11*

**“The Eight-day Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

A friend has just stepped in to ask for an explanation of *Ezekiel 43:26, 27*, which has been presented to him by some zealous people as a sure proof that God ordained the Sunday as the Sabbath. After satisfying his mind on the subject, it occurred to us that others might be troubled in a similar manner, so we call attention to the text here. It reads thus:-*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.12*

“Seven days shall they purge the altar and purify it; and they shall consecrate themselves. And when these days are expired, it shall be, that upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt-offerings upon the altar, and your peace-offerings; and I will accept you, saith the Lord.”*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.13*

The taking of this text as an argument for Sunday observance is a specimen of the too common practice of adopting a theory, and then seizing upon some text and trying to fit it to the theory *by sound*, regardless of what it actually says, or of its connection. In this way many honest people deceive themselves, thinking that they



are really studying the Bible; and many people who are not so honest deceive others who have little acquaintance with the word. In this case let the reader note the following points:-*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.14*

1. There is not in the entire chapter, nor in the chapter before, or the chapter following, any mention of the Sabbath or of Sabbath observance. The subject of discourse is the sanctuary and the altar that was to be built for Jewish service.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.15*

2. The verses in question are a part of the directions as to how the priests should prepare the altar for service. *Verses 13-17* give the dimensions of the altar; and *verses 18-27* give the ordinances of the altar, to prepare it for regular use. Bullocks and goats were to be slain and offered as sin-offerings, to cleanse the altar." See *verses 18-25*. For seven days these ceremonies were to be performed, and then it would be ready for service; and from the eighth day it was to be in constant use, not every eighth day, but upon the eighth day and onward, every day. This is all there is in the text, and all that can be made from it. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and "whoso readeth, let him understand."*SITI July 21, 1890, page 418.16*

3. But some, not satisfied with learning what the text clearly says, will say that it may mean something else; so we will, in a few words, show what it cannot possibly mean. We will grant, for the moment, for the sake of giving the Sunday cause every possible advantage, that the seven days were to begin with Sunday, so that the eighth day would also fall on Sunday, and that the expression, "upon the eighth day and so forward," means every eighth day, instead of every succeeding day. No what? Does that prove that the certain thing commanded was to be performed every Sunday? Not by any means, as can be seen by anybody who can count as far as eight on his fingers. The next eighth day would be Monday, the next one Tuesday, the next one Wednesday, the next one Thursday, the next Friday, and the next Saturday; and only once in seven weeks would it be possible for it to fall upon Sunday. Every day of the week would receive the same treatment. It requires no great mathematical skill to figure that out.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.1*

4. Again; supposing still that the text means that the eighth day was to fall on Sunday, and that the expression, “and forward,” means only every eighth day, let us see how it will work in an exactly parallel expression. Turn to *Leviticus 22:27*, and read:-*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.2*

“When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord.”*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.3*

Now, according to the argument which makes *Ezekiel 43:27* teach Sunday observance, we learn that a young bullock or sheep or goat was to be exempt from use as a sacrifice for the first seven days of its life, but that every eighth day after that it was to be offered as a burnt-offering! Impossible? Oh, no; it must be so, or else the argument that makes Sunday the Sabbath will fall to the ground!*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.4*

5. But we haven't yet exhausted the possibilities of *Leviticus 22:27*. From the Sunday theory of *Ezekiel 43:27* we have learned that “the eighth day and so forward” means not only every eighth day, but that every eighth day falls on a Sunday, and that thus the text is an evidence that Sunday was to be observed. So by the same token we learn that when a young bullock or sheep or goat had lived with its mother seven days, it was to be offered as a sacrifice on the eighth day, which, of course, was always a Sunday, and that every Sunday thereafter (every eighth day) it was likewise to be offered as a burnt-offering, in order to show the Jews that in the new dispensation Sunday would be the Sabbath.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.5*

This is nonsense? Of course it is; and so is the argument which makes *Ezekiel 43:27* refer to Sunday. You say that anybody can see that what *Leviticus 22:27* means is that from the eighth day of an animal's life it may be taken at any time, no matter what the day, as a burnt-offering. Certainly; we agree with you; but what seems so strange to us is that anybody should not be able to see just as easily that what is meant in *Ezekiel 43:27* is that after the altar had been purified for seven days, it could be used any day thereafter,

no matter what day of the week, and every day, if necessary, for burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.6*

6. And now, finally, doesn't it seem as though the Sunday cause must be extremely destitute of argument, when its friends are forced to use such palpably absurd methods to support it? Could there be any stronger argument brought against the claim that Sunday is the Sabbath than the effort to get Sunday argument out of *Ezekiel 43:27*? Contrast this with the simple language of the fourth commandment, in connection with *Genesis 2:1-3*. "What is the chaff to the wheat?" E. J. W. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.7*

**"Notes on the International Lesson. Lost and Found. *Luke 15:1-10*" The Signs of the Times, 16, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

**NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.  
(*Luke 15:1-10*. July 27, 1890.)**

"Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him." The publicans were those who gathered the *publienum*, or government revenue. The publicans of the New Testament were, according to Trench, "men of an inferior sort, who did the lower work of the collection. They were everywhere hateful for their rudeness, their frauds, their vexations, and oppressions; we possess long lists of opprobrious epithets with which, among the Greeks, they were assailed. But there was that which made keener yet the scorn, and more intense the hatred, with which the Jewish publicans were regarded by their own countrymen. They were nothing less than renegades and traitors, who for filthy lucre's sake had sided with the enemy, and now collected for a profane heathen treasury that tribute which was the evident sign of the subjection of God's people to a Gentile yoke. This scorn and hate found utterance in a thousand ways; no alms might be received from their money chest; their testimony was not received in courts of justice; they were as the heathen, and in some sort worse than the heathen." *SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.8*

Their calling was a lawful one, yet full of temptation. The natural

tendency of most men would be to take advantage of the opportunity which it so abundantly offered to make money dishonestly, since nothing but an eager desire for money would tempt one to put himself under the ban of public sentiment; and the fact that the publicans were everywhere despised, would naturally tend to give them a despicable character. That as a class they were very bad is shown by the connection in which they are frequently referred to—"publicans and sinners;" also by Christ's statement that an incorrigible church-member was to be regarded "as an heathen man and a publican." *Matthew 18:17*. Yet they were not wholly depraved, nor insusceptible to good influences, as is shown by many instances. They were sinners, it is true, but still in a more hopeful condition than were the self-righteous Pharisees. See *Matthew 21:31*. We find this verified in *Luke 7:29, 30*, where we are told that the publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him. They also flocked to hear Christ's teaching, as noted in this lesson, because he had a message of hope for them. *SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.9*

"And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." The pride and bigotry of the scribes and Pharisees are shown by this murmur. But we may leave them, to consider the charge that they brought against Jesus. "This man receiveth sinners." It is a cause for joy to know that the Pharisees told the truth on this occasion. Christ receives sinners. "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out," said he. *John 6:37*. He sends out the gracious invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." *Matthew 11:28*. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." *Romans 5:8*. He calls sinners to him, and receives them, because they are sinners, and he alone has the power to cleanse from sin. Would that every despondent sinner might believe the words spoken of Christ, "This man receiveth sinners." Poor, blind Pharisees! They trusted to themselves that they were righteous, and did not know that they were sinners, even worse than the despised publicans. Had they known that, they might have proved to their everlasting joy the truth of that which they supposed was a bitter reproach; for Christ would

have received them likewise.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.10*

*Verses 4-9* contain two vivid illustrations of God's interest in sinners. The first one is this:-*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.11*

"What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance."*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.12*

In this the reasonableness of Christ's receiving sinners is shown. Anybody would go to search for a lost sheep, even though it was only one out of a hundred. God's creatures are his flock. How natural that he should seek after the lost ones. "The Son of man is come to save that which was lost." And since he came at an infinite personal sacrifice, to save the lost ones, who can for a moment doubt that he will gladly receive those who come to him? How is it possible for a sinner to doubt the willingness of Christ to receive him? He gave his life for no other purpose than that they might come to him. He "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity."*Titus 2:14.SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.13*

"Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." But where are they that need no repentance? Not on this earth, certainly; "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."*Romans 3:23.* It will not do to say that Christ meant that there is more joy over one sinner that repents, than there would be over ninety-nine that needed not to repent, if there were any such. It is evident that those who need no repentance must be the unfallen angels and the inhabitants of other worlds. But this is a minor matter. The great point is that not only is Christ willing to receive sinners, but he calls for them, and rejoices when they come.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.14*

"Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels

of God over one sinner that repenteth.” It does not say that there is joy among the angels over one sinner that repenteth, although we may be sure that they who are sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation, are deeply interested in everything that concerns them. But there is joy “in the presence of the angels.” The Father and the Son do not conceal their joy “over one sinner that repenteth.” Who, then, may despise the day of small things, or esteem it a small thing to convert one sinner? What if the labor be hard, and the expenditure great, and only one soul is saved as the result, is it a small thing to add to the joy of Heaven? And does not this give us a clue to the meaning of the words which the Lord will say to the faithful servants, namely, “Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord”? The joy of the Lord is to see sinners repent and be saved. This joy is great because the salvation, has been achieved at an immense sacrifice. If we are permitted to share the joy of the Lord, it will be to rejoice over the salvation, not of ourselves, merely, but of others, and especially of those whom our influence has helped to bring to the knowledge of the gospel. E. J. W.*SITI July 21, 1890, page 419.15*

**July 28, 1890**

**“Church Union” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have received a very interesting pamphlet entitled, “Which? One Church or Many?” written by W. K. Marshall, D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, introduced by Dr. James Burrell, of the Presbyterian Church, the object of which is to advance the idea of a union of the various Protestant churches. The author quotes the numerous passages of Scripture which speak of the unity that should exist among the followers of Christ, declaring the church of Christ to be *one body* and which rebuke the tendency to schisms in the church, and then briefly reviews church history. Coming to our own country, he finds many powerful reasons for church union, chief of which are the growing disregard of Sunday; the gigantic proportions of the liquor traffic; the boldness and impudence of infidelity; the encroachments of Romanism, and secularism upon our public-school system; the corruption of party politics; and the rapid growth of cities, and the diminishing proportion of church-membership. These things, he says, “cry loudly for some kind of organic and practical union among the churches of Protestantism, which has not yet been realized, that they may stand solid, compact, aggressive, triumphant in the face of these mighty forces of evil which confront us upon every hand.” *SITI July 28, 1890, page 420.1*

After noticing the hopeful signs on such a union manifested in the different churches, he mentions as the five points upon which there must be agreement: The recognition of the right of every Christian to the Lord’s table, no matter by whom spread; the recognition of the right of all Christians to their private judgment; the validity of the ordination of the ministry in all orthodox bodies; the willingness of each sect to surrender and totally abandon everything that stands in the way of recovering the lost unity of the church, although each body is to retain its own distinctive organization; and then he summarizes the methods and results as follows:- *SITI July 28, 1890, page 420.2*

“Such a union as would cover these five points, it is believed, might be brought about by a federation of all Protestant bodies, and as exists among the different States of our republic, each single body preserving its denominational integrity and independence as to ecclesiastical polity. Its peculiarities as the methods and all doctrinal faith, and in all practical methods of a general missionary work, the evangelization of the masses in the great cities, the building of hospitals, orphan asylums, training-schools, deaconesses’ homes, Bible-schools, the support of Sabbath observance, temperance, and other reforms, the enforcement of just and righteous laws for the promotion of public morality, and all other enterprises and agencies that tend to herald the day when our Lord and Saviour will indeed claim the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.” *SITI July 28, 1890, page 420.3*

We have outlined the little book thus at length because we think that it is a very significant sign of the times. While we recognize the Christian spirit and honest purpose of the author, we cannot fail to recognize in his plan the erroneous idea that is becoming so prevalent, that the church is, by some sort of combination, to purify politics, and by means of purified politics to bring in the millennium. Our criticism, in brief, is as follows:- *SITI July 28, 1890, page 420.4*

1. We know that as Christ is not divided, his church is not divided. “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling.” *Ephesians 4:4*. The true members of Christ’s body are all baptized by one Spirit into that body (*1 Corinthians 12:13*); and this shows that any union that is mechanical, and not the result of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, will be no real union. It will be the same as a “marriage of convenience.” All who have the one Spirit are by that Spirit made members of one body. They form a real union, and not a confederation. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 420.5*

2. While unity is a very desirable thing, it is not desirable if truth has to be sacrificed to attain it. It is deplorable that there are so many sects in Christendom; but those divisions are inevitable, so long as people do not hold to the same things; and only the Holy Spirit can cause men to see alike. The truth of God is the only true basis of church union, and those who do not agree upon this cannot be



really united, no matter what combination is formed. If it is claimed that men “cannot see alike,” we have only to reply that they can if they are led by the one Spirit; for the Holy Spirit is given for the purpose of leading believers into all truth; and since there is only one Spirit, one truth, and one hope, people must see alike just to the extent that they are led by that Spirit.*SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.1*

3. If a union were effected by any other than purely spiritual means, the inevitable result would be the using of the combined power in an unspiritual manner, to influence politics, and then would be demonstrated the truth of the statement that “combinations of religious bodies for political purposes are always dangerous,” and this notwithstanding the good intentions of the people so combining. Such a federation of churches into one general church, working for the ends proposed, some of which directly involve legislation, would be nothing less than a State church; and the evils that would result would be vastly greater than those which now exist.*SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.2*

Therefore while we most heartily believe in Christian union, we have no confidence in any scheme of a union of churches. The latter may be brought about by negotiations between the representatives of leading denominations; the former only by a faithful preaching of the truth as it is in Jesus, depending upon no power but the power of the Spirit. E. J. W.*SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.3*

**“Communion Wine” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

The pastor of St. Paul’s M. E. Church, in Lowell, Mass., has decided upon an innovation. In a conversation following a recent class-meeting, one of the members stated that before his conversion he was addicted to the use of liquor, and that he strongly disapproved the use of wine at the sacrament, as he had twice fallen, by the temptation thus placed in his way. The pastor stated that he could never pass the wine to this brother after learning this fact, and he had long been debating in his mind the

advisability of discontinuing its use. He was followed by others, who strongly urged him to use pure water instead of wine at the communion service, commencing next Sunday. This he promised to do, and his promise was unanimously indorsed. Consequently, nothing but pure water will be used at the communion service at St. Paul's hereafter, and it is believed to be the first Methodist Church to adopt the practice." *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.4*

The Lowell *Mail*, from which the above is taken, adds:-*SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.5*

"This question was agitated in this city at a union meeting of the Methodist Churches some years ago, but its adoption was defeated by a single vote." *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.6*

Thus one unscriptural practice leads to another. To use water instead of wine at communion is the same as having no communion at all. Such a ceremony is most certainly not the one which the Saviour instituted. The Catholic Church is more consistent in withholding the cup entirely from the laity, although it uses it in the mass. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.7*

But all this perversion of the ordinance would be avoided if the communion were celebrated, as it should be, with the "fruit of the vine," the pure, unfermented grape juice. This, and this only, is fit to be used as an emblem of "the precious blood of Christ,"-the incorruptible thing by which we are redeemed,-and there is no more danger in it than there is in the fruit which is served daily upon the table. The Lord knew what he was doing when he instituted the Lord's Supper; and he never sets temptation in any man's ways. When men try to improve on his ordinances, they always get into trouble. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.8*

**"The True Circumcision. *Romans 2:17-29*" The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

"Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art

confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest they boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written. For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore, if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.”*SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.9*

Before dwelling upon the one central thought of these verses, we will call attention to a few of the incidental points. From *verses 17 and 18* we learn that the law of God, in which the Jews made their boast, is the will of God. They knew the will of God, because they were instructed out of the law. This fact settles the matter of the breadth, the holiness, and the unchanging nature of the law of God. Someone may object that the law could not be the perfect expression of God’s will, since the Jews, who rested in it, were so far from perfect. But Paul provides the answer to that by showing that although they rested in the law, it was only the pride of possession which they felt, while they disregarded its claims.*SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.10*

“Which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.” In Coneybeare and Howsen’s free translation, this is rendered, “Possessing in the law the perfect pattern of knowledge and of truth.” This is exactly what the law is, and this is why those who are instructed out of it are able to “approve the things that are more

excellent" (see *verse 18*), or, as the margin says, "try the things that differ," or, as Conybeare and Howsen put it, still more plainly, "give judgment upon good and evil." The law of God-the ten commandments-is that by which every work, with every secret thing, is to be brought into judgment." See *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.11*

*Verses 21-23* contain a series of pointed questions, which are in reality a strong arraignment of those "who trusted in themselves, because they do the same things; and he clinches the point so plainly implied in his questions, by saying, "For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written." Reference is here unmistakably made to *2 Samuel 12:14*, where we find that the prophet Nathan, speaking of David's adultery, said to him, "Because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die." Therefore, when the apostle said to the Jews, "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you," he directly charged them with living in open violation of the law which they professed to honor. Professors of religion may cause the name of God to be blasphemed, by living lives contrary to their profession; and thus, although they may appear very reverent in their speech, they may be guilty of violating the third commandment. So true is it that the breaking of one commandment involves violation of another. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.12*

Having now convicted the Jews of transgression of the law of God, and shown that they are therefore even worse than the heathen, who had not the written law, the apostle proceeds to show (in *verses 23-25*) that they are not in reality Jews at all. This is a very important passage of Scripture. It proves not only that God is not now a respecter of persons, but that he never was, and that the condition of his favor are the same to all people in all ages. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.13*

"For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law." As will be seen more directly from *chap. 3:1, 2* when we reach it, the term "circumcision" has not so much reference to the physical act as to the people who were specially represented by it. "The circumcision" and "the uncircumcision" were common terms to indicate the Jews

and the Gentiles. See *Galatians 2:7-9*. So when Paul said that circumcision profits if they keep the law, he meant that it was a good thing to be a Jew if one kept the law. Wherein the profit lay, we shall learn in the next chapter. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.14*

“But if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.” That is, those who were circumcised as the literal descendants of Abraham, were in reality not circumcised, and were consequently not children of Abraham, if they did not keep the law. This was what John the Baptist told the Pharisees who flocked to his baptism. Calling them a viper’s brood, he said, “And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” *Matthew 3:9*. Sooner than acknowledge such hypocrites as children of Abraham, God would make children out of stones. Jesus, also, when the wicked Jews said, “Abraham is our father,” replied: “If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God; this did not Abraham.” *John 8:39, 40*. And then he directly charged them with being children of the devil. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 426.15*

“Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?” Let it be remembered that only Abraham’s children are the children of God (*Galatians 3:29*), and that all of Abraham’s children were to be circumcised. *Genesis 17:10*. But in the verse just quoted, Paul says that keeping the law is counted to an uncircumcised man as circumcision. Therefore, although according to the Scriptures only the circumcised are the children of God, it follows that the man who obeyed God is and was owned as a child of God, even though the rite of circumcision had never been performed upon him. And this is in harmony with Peter’s statement that “God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” *Acts 10:34, 35*. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.1*

The whole matter is summed up and emphasized in the last two verses, which we requite:-*SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.2*

“For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.3*

A few parallel texts will indicate the harmony of the Scriptures on this point. In *Ephesians 2:11* the apostle Paul speaks to the converts from among the heathen as those who were “called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh.” He does not speak of either party absolutely, as being uncircumcised or circumcised, but as being “called uncircumcision” and called “circumcision.” This is in keeping with his statement that “circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandment of God.” *1 Corinthians 7:19. SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.4*

In *Philippians 3:3* Paul says, “We are the circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh;” and in *Acts 7:51-53* we learn from Stephen that the Jews were “uncircumcised in heart and ears,” because they resisted the Holy Ghost, and had not kept the law, which they had received by the disposition of angels. This, taken in connection with *Romans 2:28, 29*, proves that true circumcision was of the heart. In harmony with this idea were the words of Jesus to Nathanael, “Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.” *John 1:47. SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.5*

Let not the reader get the idea that this view of circumcision, and of the true Israel, is peculiar to what is known as “the Christian dispensation.” Nothing less than yielding the heart to the influences of the Holy Spirit, and keeping the commandments of God, has ever been recognized as true circumcision. In *Romans 4:10, 11* Paul speaks of the time when circumcision was first given to Abraham, and says that “he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised.” Circumcision, therefore, was a sign of righteousness, and a sign does not of itself amount to anything if the thing signified is wanting. And so even in the days of Abraham, Moses, and the later prophets, the outward form counted for nothing with the Lord; only

obedience was counted as circumcision. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.6*

This is shown by *Deuteronomy 30:6-8*: “And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies, and on them that hate thee, which persecute thee. And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the Lord, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day.” See also *chap. 10:16*, and *Jeremiah 4:4*. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.7*

A right idea of what really constituted a Jew, according to the Scripture, constituted a Jew, according to the Scripture, will settle many a disputed point. It shows the unity of God's plan of salvation; that he was not partial in choosing the Jews; and that his requirements are the same in all generations. It helps us to understand also the full extent of the promises to the Jews, and lifts the Old Testament history out of the narrow boundaries which so many regard it as occupying. It settles the question as to the return of their own land, and enables us to see wisdom and justice in the statement that “all Israel shall be saved.” E. J. W. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.8*

**“Notes on the International Lesson. The Prodigal Son. *Luke 15:22-21*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

(Luke, August 3, 1890, p. 15.)

There are few more comforting passages of Scripture than the parable of the prodigal son. Coming in the connection that it does, it carries its explanation with it: It is a most graphic representation of the love of God for the rebellious sons of men, and of his longing to receive them to himself again. It is true that it was spoken for the special benefit of the scribes and Pharisees, who murmured because Jesus received publicans and sinners, being designed to show how more than willing God is to receive the most degraded and despised sinners; but this very fact makes it the more valuable,

for if he will receive such, we may know that he will receive all. It is a vivid illustration of the saying, “Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.” *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.9*

The younger son in the parable may stand for all sinners. Everything that they have they have received from God; yet, forgetful of their obligation to him, they have despised his ways, and have “gone away backward.” We may not press too closely the main points in the narrative, which are necessary to give it form; yet it seems allowable to compare the young man’s joining himself to a citizen of the country, when he began to be in want, to the sinner’s plunging deeper into sin in order to shake off the first convictions of sin. How often when the want of God first makes itself felt, a man thinks to satisfy the want by joining himself more closely to the world. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.10*

“And he sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat; and no man gave unto him.” He was now deserted by the false friends that flocked around him in his prosperous days, and was denied even the poor privilege of trying to satisfy his craving with the coarsest kind of fare. The husks, it is hardly necessary to say, were not the husks of corn, but were the pods of the carob tree, which somewhat resembled the locust. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.11*

“And when he came to himself, he said.... I will arise and go to my father.” Although his position as a feeder of swine, forsaken by his companions, and starving, seems a most pitiable one, he was far better off now than when he was spending his substance in riotous living. Then he was intoxicated, and unable to distinguish the proper relation of things. Now the dizzy whirl had ceased, and he came to himself. He was in just as bad condition before as now, but he didn’t know it. The worst thing about backslidden professors is not that they are “wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked,” but that, being in this condition, they know it not. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.12*

The office of the Holy Spirit is to convince of sin and of righteousness. Often the conviction is produced in a way that seems very humiliating. Too often, when the conviction has been



brought about by plain reproof, the sinner becomes angry at the reproof, thinking that it was administered for the purpose of humiliating him. He does not realize that the humiliation which he feels is due entirely to the position in which he has placed himself, and which the reproof has revealed to him. The reproof which brings conviction shows the kindness of God in seeking to rescue him from his fallen condition. The witness of the Spirit that we are the children of God is no surer evidence that God cares for us than is the reproof of his Spirit, which brings the shame of conviction, "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourageth every son whom he receiveth." *SITI July 28, 1890, page 427.13*

Note how quickly the father cuts short the confession. He does not wait for him to go into a detailed account of all the evil deeds that he has committed. It is enough that the son has returned repentant to his father's house. He is alive, and coming back to put himself under the father's care and guidance. The son had no claim on the father; he had spent all the portion of the estate that would have fallen to him, yet the father receives him on the same footing as though he had never gone astray. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 428.1*

And so the great point to be learned from this parable is that God receives sinners just as they are. If the poor prodigal had thought, when he came to a sense of his need, that he must fix himself up with a decent suit of clothes before he could go to his father, he would never have gone. The sinner is justified only by faith; and faith comes only when self-trust ceases. Whoever is overwhelmed with the sense of his sin, and despised, perhaps, by men, may know that for him there is hope, for "this Man receiveth sinners." E. J. W. *SITI July 28, 1890, page 428.2*

## August 4, 1890

“The Penalty of the Law” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

“Will you be so kind as to explain your statement, ‘When Adam fell he brought the race of mankind under the sentence of eternal death.’ (*The Signs of the Times*, July 7, 1890), with the fact that he did not die an eternal death? Did he suffer less than the penalty of the law? W.T.D.” *SITI August 4, 1890, page 428.3*

In answer to the second question we answer, Yes; and that really answers the whole. If Adam had suffered the penalty of the law, he would have died an eternal death; for “the wages of sin is death.” This means death simple and absolute, with no hope of a resurrection. The penalty of the law has fallen upon only one being, and that was Christ. “But he did not die an eternal death.” No; he died for us, that we might be partakers of his life. His death is a part of the great mystery of the gospel, for it is impossible for us to understand how the divine Son of God, the Creator, who had life in himself, could die. But as he, who knew no sin, took our sin upon himself, - was made to be sin for us, - so he voluntarily became obedient unto that death which sin brings. He died for us, however, and not for himself; and since there was no stain of sin upon him, it was not possible that death should hold him (*Acts 2:24*), for it is sin alone that gives power to death. He had life enough for himself and for all the world besides; therefore when he laid down his life as a forfeit to the violated law, he could take it again. To all who accept him he imparts his own life, which has triumphed over death, and they receive the penalty of the law in him; but when the law demands the life of an unrepentant sinner, as a penalty for its violation, it takes all that he has, and there is no possibility of his living again. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 428.4*

Death, then, is to the Christian in reality only an incident in his life, - a short sleep. “The sting of sin is death;” and when sin has been removed through Christ, of course death has no power to harm. The Christian only sleeps in Jesus. His life has not been taken, for, says Paul to all Christians, “Ye are dead, and your life is hid with

Christ in God.” *Colossians 3:3*. “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” *1 John 5:11*. That which Christ has in his keeping is beyond the reach of Satan or of his agent. Therefore it is certain that the death which those die who believe in Christ (among whom we, as well as our correspondent, place Adam), is not the penalty of the law of God. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 428.5*

This is made very plain by the words of Christ: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” *John 5:24*. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 428.6*

But death is common to all mankind. The righteous and the wicked both die alike, the only difference being that “the righteous hath hope in his death.” But it is certain that the death which even wicked men now die is not the death which is the wages of sin, for the wicked as well as the righteous are to have a resurrection, when they will receive according to that which they have done. Judgment is not executed upon the ungodly until the Lord comes. *Jude 14, 15*. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 428.7*

The words of Christ, recorded in *John 3:16-18*, throw great light upon this whole question: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” This of itself proves that all men who are without Christ are under the sentence of death. This makes it evident that when Paul says that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” (*Romans 5:12*), he refers to that death which is the wages of sin. It was because Christ saw all the world in this condemnation, that he gave himself for the world, so that all who would believe in him could be freed from condemnation. That they were condemned to perish is shown by the fact that God gave his Son to save them from perishing; and those who believe

not are condemned already.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 428.8*

This sentence of death was made known to Adam as soon as he was placed in the garden of Eden, as a warning against sin. When he sinned, he at once came under condemnation, doomed to suffer the threatened penalty. But right here came in the gospel. The sacrifice of Christ was just as efficacious the day that Adam sinned as it is to-day; he is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. For all practical purposes Christ was crucified as soon as Adam fell, for God "callethe those things which be not as though they were." Christ was given at that time. The sacrifice on the part of God, to give his only begotten Son, was already made; God loved the world then just as much as he did four thousand years later.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.1*

If it had not been that Christ was given for man's redemption, death would have ended all for Adam, and for all the human race. But the promise of a Redeemer carried with it another probation, and so the execution of the sentence was suspended until it should be seen what use men would make of that probation. God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ (*Acts 17:31*); and until that time the sentence will be held in abeyance. Christ has suffered it, and all who receive him, receive the penalty in him, and his life answers for theirs. But those who reject the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God will abide on them. They will receive the penalty in themselves, and thus the course of sin will be brought to a close, and the law will be vindicated. E. J. W.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.2*

**"Sunday in California" The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is a specimen of the *mis* information that is dealt out to Eastern people, concerning the status of Sunday in California. It is from a church report from Southern California to the New York *Christian Advocate*:-*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.3*

"California is in an anomalous position in reference to Sunday legislation. In the early days, when this country was little more than

a vast mining camp, and Sabbath desecration was well-nigh universal among the inhabitants, it had enacted a good, wholesome statute, protecting Christian people in their religious services. But a few years ago an overwise governor suggested that this law was largely a “dead letter,” and so, for consistency’s sake, it was repealed. So now Sunday is simply a public holiday, being classed with the Fourth of July, New Year’s day, etc. The State laws give no protection to religious assemblages on the Lord’s day, any more than a base-ball game. Those legislators of the early days had not outgrown the influences of their Eastern Christian homes and the sacred associations of the Lord’s day; so while many of them doubtless were careless and more or less wicked, they embodied in the laws of their new State laws protecting and fostering the interests of the Christian church and the Christian home. But the sad results of bad training have caused a later race of legislators to tear down the barriers set up against vice and crime; so that, so far as the State law is concerned, all over California business may be carried on as on other days, the only disability being that notes and other documents signed and dated on that day are not legal.”*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.4*

1. The Sunday law that California formerly had, and which was repealed a little less than eight years ago, had nothing whatever to do with the protection of Christian people in their religious services. It was a Sunday law forbidding certain kinds of labor and amusement on Sunday. That is all there was to it.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.5*

2. “An overwise governor” had nothing to do with its repeal. It was repealed because a majority of the people of California testified at the ballot-box that they wanted to rid California of a legacy handed down from the Dark Ages, when there was no other way known of making men religious but the rack and the thumb-screw. The sole issue in the campaign that year was over the Sunday law. The Republicans pledged themselves to maintain and enforce it; the Democrats in their platform declared against it. On this issue the Democrats won, and when the Legislature repealed the law, it was simply carrying out the pledge made by the Democratic party, and the instruction of the people at the polls.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.6*

3. It is not true that “the State laws give no protection to religious assemblages on the Lord’s day, any more than to a base-ball game.” Section 302 of the Penal Code is as follows:-*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.7*

“Every person who willfully disturbs or disquiets any assemblage of people met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or by any unnecessary noise either within the place where such meeting is held, or so near as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of a misdemeanor.”*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.8*

Here is protection enough for anybody. In fact, it affords too much protection to suit many people, who would have it specify religious assemblages of those who observe Sunday, leaving others unprotected. There is not a State in the Union where a disturber of any religious gathering would meet with quicker punishment than in California. But there is no special law protecting base-ball games.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.9*

4. It is true that Sunday is now simply a public holiday, being classed with the Fourth of July, New Year’s Day, etc. But surely our Sunday-law friends should be the last to complain, since they cite the Fourth of July and other holidays as precedents for making Sunday a holiday.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.10*

5. But it is not true that sad results are seen because of the repeal of the Sunday law. The day is observed as strictly as it ever was, and public morals are as good as in any State which has a rigid Sunday law. California has nothing of which to boast in the way of morals; but what it needs is more gospel instead of more law. E. J. W.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.11*

**“The Golden Rule Ignored” The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the following from an article in the *New Englander and Yale Review*, on “Legal Protection for Sunday Rest,” by W. W. Atterbury, D.D., we have a very fair sample of an error into which those who

argue for Sunday laws are continually running; namely, that of imagining that what is done solely out of regard for the day is done for the benefit of the people:-*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.12*

“We may advance a step farther, to another ground upon which the Sunday laws rest. The chief and highest use to which the weekly rest is put, by the American people generally, is its religious use. And so the law recognizes and protects the right of undisturbed worship, to which the day is devoted. There is a right of worship as well as of non-worship. When the great majority of a people set apart one day for that purpose, it is just and right that their laws should recognize that fact, and, so far as may be needful to this end, protect them, both from being robbed of its opportunity of worship, and being disturbed in its enjoyment. Though it be granted that the law transcends its sphere in a free government when it compels the religious observance of the day, it by no means follows that it transcends its proper sphere when, not enforcing the religious observance of the day, it protects those who may choose so to use it. A Christian people have a right to the undisturbed enjoyment of their day of worship. In a Mohammedan country, the law might justly protect from wanton disturbance the day then set apart for religious use; or in a Jewish State, the law would protect the Jewish Sabbath. In a Christian country, the law rightfully protects from disturbance the Lord’s day; and this not because Christianity is the true religion, but because it is the religion of the people.”*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.13*

Now according to this, all that is desired is that the people shall be protected in their right to worship on Sunday; yet what is asked for is not a law to protect *the people*, but a law to protect *the day*-to keep people from doing any labor on it. But, as a matter of fact, there are in every State laws that are amply sufficient to protect all people in their right to assemble for religious worship. Anybody ought to be able to see that it is not necessary to compel everybody to rest on Sunday, in order to secure to a portion of the people the right to rest and worship on that day. The fact that five hundred people go to the woods for a picnic or to the sea-shore on Sunday, does not prevent one hundred other people from going to church and quietly worshiping on that day.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 434.14*

Another fault with the paragraph above quoted, and a very serious fault it is too, is the utter failure to comprehend the principles of true liberty, on which the American government was founded. The Declaration of Independence holds that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; not of a majority simply, but of all. It holds that all men are created equal, that is, in regard to the rights with which the Creator has endowed them, and which government should preserve for them. Governments are for the purpose of protecting the rights of all, and not simply of the majority. Any law which does not equally respect the rights of all is an unjust law.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.1*

When evil things are done by wholesale, they somehow seem to command respect; the human mind seems to be overawed by anything that is large. Thus, a million-dollar defaulter can find ready access to the "best society," while the petty larcenist is looked upon with contempt. It is well to keep in mind that that which is evil in detail is proportionately evil in mass. If a dozen persons were together in a social party, and ten of them should combine to have everything *their* way, ignoring the rights and wishes of the other two, it would be called gross selfishness. And that is just what it is when the government is asked to make laws that not only ignore but trample upon the rights of the minority.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.2*

Dr. Atterbury says, "In a Mohammedan country, the law might justly protect from wanton disturbance the day there set apart for religious use." In the first place, a day cannot be disturbed, and therefore has no need of being protected from disturbance. But the people who wish to observe the day may be disturbed, and they not only may be, but ought to be, protected from wanton disturbance. But would the doctor think it right and just for the Mohammedan government to give its Mohammedan subjects full liberty to disturb its comparatively few Christian subjects in their worship on the day which they hold sacred?-Of course not. And he and everybody else knows full well that to protect Christians in their right to worship undisturbed on the day which they religiously observe, would not in the least interfere with the protection guaranteed to Mohammedans in their worship on the day which they devote to religious purposes.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.3*



“Or in a Jewish State, the law would protect the Jewish Sabbath.” In a Jewish State or in a “Christian State” the law has no business to know anything except the welfare of all of its citizens. If the majority of the citizens of any country were Jews, the laws, if they were just, would afford as much protection to the Christian as to the Jew. So the laws of this country should afford as much protection to Jews as to Christians. Has not almost the whole civilized world made indignant protest against “Jew-baiting” in some parts of Europe? But what right have the advocates of Sunday laws to protest against outrages committed upon Jews? The people of those countries are Catholic, and the governments are professedly Christian, and the laws are made for “Christians,” and not for Jews. If Jews are not to be protected by law, because they are in the minority, then of course they may be insulted with impunity; and it is for just this state of things that Sunday-law advocates are pleading, although we have the charity to believe that most of them do not realize what they are doing. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.4*

The Christian rule is, “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.” Therefore while there cannot be in this world such a thing as a Christian government, that government in which the majority grant to the minority the same protection which they claim for themselves, approaches the nearest to the standard which Christ gave. In such a government the rights of the majority are respected, not because they are the majority, but because they are men; and the rights of the minority are equally respected for the same reason. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.5*

This is a live subject, and cannot receive too much attention. When men in high position can advocate the passing of laws for the gratification (not the benefit) of a certain class, it is evident that they have strayed far from the principles held by the founders of this government, as well as from the principles of the gospel, and that they are unsafe leaders. E. J. W. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.6*

**“The Rich Man and Lazarus. *Luke 16:19-31*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 30.**

E. J. Waggoner

**INTERNATIONAL LESSON NOTES.**

**(Luke 16:19-21; August 10, 1890.)**

There is probably no portion of Scripture that has been the subject of more controversy than this one, and none which has been more the subject of that grossest of all exegetical view-private interpretation; that is, interpretation according to sound, and not according to sense; interpretation according to one's previously-conceived opinions, without any regard to the context or to the testimony of other portions of Scripture, on the same point. Accordingly, the first and chief work of the commentator on this passage is to disabuse the minds of his hearers of erroneous notions, by showing what it does not mean. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.7*

That this scripture is of the nature of a parable is evident, because to give all its terms a literal application would make nonsense of it. The characters are spoken of as individuals in the flesh, having all the organs and all the desires of men in the flesh. They have eyes, tongues, bosom, power of speech, thirst, love of brethren, etc. But how could Lazarus be in Abraham's bosom? If Lazarus was taken there, then all the saved must be there, likewise, and that is an impossibility. This, of itself, shows that this is not a literal narrative. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.8*

More than this, the general testimony of Scriptures as to the condition of men in death, shows that it is impossible that this should be the story of an actual transaction. In *Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6* we read: "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." And this agrees with the words of *Job 14:21*. David also says: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Hezekiah also said: "For the grave cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." *Isaiah 38:18. SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.9*

These are strong, positive statements. They cannot be ignored or

explained away, without denying the inspiration of the Scriptures of which they form a part. We must believe that they mean just what they say; and therefore we know that the portion of Scripture that we are studying cannot mean that two persons actually carried on a conversation after death. Since a man knows nothing in the grave; he is unconscious of the prosperity of the adversity of his sons; and his thoughts have ceased, it is evident that a man could not after death feel any solicitude for the welfare of his brethren.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.10*

But someone will cry, "Who have we not as good right to affirm consciousness after death from this passage in Luke, as you have to affirm unconsciousness after death from the texts that you have just quoted?" For this reason: If we should affirm from one text that the dead are conscious, and from another that they are unconscious, then we make the Scripture contradict itself, and thus deny its inspiration. But the statements quoted from Solomon and David and Job and Hezekiah are positive statements of fact, and the verses in Luke are not literal statements, as we have shown. Therefore we must interpret the figurative or inferential in harmony with the positive and literal; or at least we must so interpret them as not to contradict the positive.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.11*

Take another thought. David was a good man; beloved of the Lord, as well as Abraham was. But of David, Peter said when he was full of the Holy Spirit, "For David is not ascended into the heavens." *Acts 2:34*. And Paul said, "For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption." *Acts 13:36*. If David has not ascended into the heavens, then neither Abraham nor any other saint has ascended into the heavens.*SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.12*

Let us now note a few points to the parable itself. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died; and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died; and was buried." What was carried into Abraham's bosom? Was it the same Lazarus that laid at the rich man's gate? Was he carried there in person? It has already been seen that this could not be. Those who interpret the parable as teaching the condition of men in death, uniformly say that only the soul or spirit of Lazarus was taken to Abraham's

bosom. But mark, there is no change in the subject. The same one who died was carried. "The beggar died, and was carried." Shall we say that this means, "The beggar died, and his spirit was carried"? Let us see how it would work in another instance. I am telling about a tornado, and I say, "I ran out of the house and was thrown down." Someone asks, "Did it hurt you?" I reply, "How could I be hurt by the falling down of the house, when I was not in it?" And then you say, "Why, you didn't say anything about the house being thrown down; you said that you were thrown down." And this is the fact. My statement was that I fell down; if I meant to say that the house fell down, I should have said so. Likewise, what the text says is that Lazarus died, and that he, the same that died, was carried into Abraham's bosom. If it be claimed that it was simply his body that died, then it was his body that was carried. If we say that it was the soul that was carried, then it was the soul that died. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 435.13*

In like manner we say of the rich man that the same thing that died was buried. But if it be claimed that the statement that "the beggar died and was carried," etc., means that he died and that his soul was carried, then it must also be claimed that the statement that "the rich man also died, and was buried," means that the rich man died and his soul was buried. All this serves simply to show that the passage is not a literal narrative of an actual occurrence, and that therefore it has no bearing whatever on the condition of man in death. The fact that dead men are represented as talking, no more proves that it is natural for dead men to talk, than the fact that in *Judges 9:8-15* the trees, the vine, and the bramble-bush are represented as talking, proves that it is natural for trees and vines to use spoken language. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 436.1*

It should also be remembered that the angels do not carry the saints to their reward at death. Jesus said that they who served him by doing deeds of kindness to those too poor to recompense them, should be recompensed "at the resurrection of the just." *Luke 14:14*. The resurrection of the just is when the Lord himself descends from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. *1 Thessalonians 4:16*. The voice of the archangel calls them from their graves. *John 5:28, 29*. It is at this time that "he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall

gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.” *Matthew 24:31*. It is then that they see the cutting off of the wicked, and not till then. Although probation ceases at death, the judgment does not decide the destiny of men till after that (*Hebrews 9:28*), even till the coming of Christ. *1 Corinthians 4:5; 2 Corinthians 5:10*. Therefore we know that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus was not given for the purpose of showing the condition of men in death. The things which it relates could take place only after the coming of Christ, and the resurrection. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 436.2*

What, then, is taught by this portion of Scripture? That is a more difficult thing to tell. Nobody is justified in telling positively what a parable means, when that parable is not explained in the Scripture. “No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation;” which means that no scripture is an explanation of its own text. If commentators and Bible students had spent as much time studying this scripture as they have in trying to fit it to their own opinions, no doubt there would have been more knowledge of its meaning. We may be sure, however, that incidentally it proves that death ends probation. It also proves that earthly prosperity is not a sign of the favor of God. This was a very necessary lesson for the Jews to learn. They despised the poor, and thought that to be rich was an evidence that God was pleased with them. Of course those who held that idea would very easily get into the habit of employing questionable means to increase their wealth, persuading themselves that the end would justify the means. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 436.3*

Another thing that should not be overlooked is the proof that the Bible is the highest authority. No phenomena can take the place of plain Scripture statements. “They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.” “If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.” This is true in a general sense. If one will not be convinced by the Bible, nothing will convince him; and when one comes to believe a thing because of certain phenomena that he has witnessed, as, for instance, of a future life because of the supposed appearance of departed friends, his form of belief is always that which the Bible does not sanction. This was especially applicable to the Jews, however, for since they

refused to be convinced of the genuineness of Christ's claims by Moses and the prophets, who testified of him, his wonderful resurrection only hardened them. E. J. W. *SITI August 4, 1890, page 436.4*

## August 11, 1890

“The Sure Foundation” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

“He saith unto them, that whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” *Matthew 16:15-19. SITI August 11, 1890, page 436.5*

Two expressions in this passage, namely, “on this rock I will build my church,” and, “I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” have been the object of a great deal of controversy, and they often seriously trouble those who take no stock in the arguments for papal authority, which the Catholics try to draw from them. It is the object of this little study to focus the light of inspiration upon them, that they may be explained, “not in the words which man’s wisdom, teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” *SITI August 11, 1890, page 436.6*

First, as to the rock upon which the church of Christ is built. Is that rock the apostle Peter? Or is it something else? That it is not Peter, may be proved both by the text itself, and by the concurrent testimony of Scripture. It is doubtless well known that the proper name Peter signifies a stone. When Jesus first saw Simon, he said to him, “Thou art Simon the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone,” or Peter. *John 1:42*. But perhaps it is not so generally known that the Greek word for Peter is entirely different from that which in *Matthew 16:18* is translated rock. Of the former, *petra*, Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon says: “A *piece of rock, a stone*, and thus distinguished from *petra*.” This latter word, *petra*, where loose

stones (*petros*) are not meant, but “masses of living rock torn up.” *SITI August 11, 1890, page 436.7*

Now with these facts before us, who can say that Peter is the rock on which the church is built? He is a stone; but the church is not built on so unstable a foundation. Peter was a man of power, and was a mighty instrument in the hands of God to help build up the church; but it would never do to build that church upon a foundation which could waver in the least; and Peter at one time, long after this, wavered so greatly that Paul was obliged to rebuke him to the face. *Galatians 2:11-14*. A fearless man of God was Peter, yet only a fallible mortal. The church is built on a rock, a crag, on something that is fixed. The difference in the terms is alone sufficient to show that the apostle Peter is not the foundation of the church. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 436.8*

Let us now see upon what, according to the inspired word, the church of Christ is actually built. In *1 Corinthians 10:4*, we are told that the Israelites in the wilderness all drank the same spiritual drink; “for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed went with them; and that Rock [*petra*] was Christ.” See also *Psalms 18:2; 92:15*. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 436.9*

In *Ephesians 2:20* we are taken a step farther. There the converted Gentiles are told that being now fellow-citizens with the saints, they are “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone.” This shows that Christ is the Rock upon which the church is built, as *1 Corinthians 10:4* shows that he is the Rock from which it derives its nourishment. If it be imagined from the wording of *Ephesians 2:20*, that the apostles are a part of the foundation, even then Peter is deprived of the position which the Catholic Church would give him as the sole foundation, the “apostles and prophets” being all included. But we shall see that the apostle does not mean that the apostles and prophets are a part of the foundation, but that the church is built upon the foundations upon which the apostles and prophets built, and which they, in a sense, laid. Thus, we read in *1 Corinthians 3:10-13*:- *SITI August 11, 1890, page 436.10*

“According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise



master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest." *SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.1*

Christ, then, and not Peter, is the foundation upon which the church is built. This will be seen more plainly still when it is remembered that the church existed in the wilderness of Sinai hundreds of years before the day of Peter. See *Acts 7:38*. When Moses identified himself with this church, he incurred the reproach of Christ. *Hebrews 11:25, 26*. The Rock from which they drank was the Rock upon which they were built. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.2*

In this connection it is interesting and profitable to note the words of Christ in closing the sermon on the mount. Having given his instruction, he said:-*SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.3*

"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock. And everyone that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell; and great was the fall of it." *Matthew 7:24-27. SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.4*

Here we learn how it is that we may build upon Christ, the Rock. It is by obeying his words. "The words that I speak unto you," said Jesus, "they are spirit, and they are life." *John 6:63*. His words are divine, like himself, whether uttered with his own voice, or by the mouth of a prophet. In fact, Christ dwells in the word; for we read that he dwells in our heart by faith (*Ephesians 3:17*), and "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." *Romans 10:17*. By receiving the words of Christ, therefore, we receive Christ himself; and so by building upon those words, we build upon Christ. The members of Christ's true church, therefore, are those in whom

the word of Christ dwells richly.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.5*

To build upon the words of Christ is to believe them so thoroughly that they are made a part of the life, and the mainspring of every action. When it is said that Abraham “believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness” (*Genesis 15:6*), the full meaning conveyed by the Hebrew is that Abraham *built upon God*. The same idea is found in *2 Chronicles 29:20*, where we have the words of Joshua, “Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper.” In reality he exhorted them to build upon the Lord, if they would be established; and contrariwise we have the words of Isaiah to Ahaz, that because he would not build upon the words of God, he should not be established. *Isaiah 7:9*. Compare these two texts with *Matthew 7:24-27*. Abraham built upon God, by doing just as God commanded him; for James tells us that Abraham’s obedience to the command to offer up Isaac was the fulfillment of the scripture which said, “Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” *James 2:23.SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.6*

Applying all this to the text under consideration, we see the force of Christ’s words. Peter, speaking for the twelve, said, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Christ in saying, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church,” puts himself, as the Rock of Ages, in direct contrast with Peter. As he said that whosoever should do his words would be building on the rock, so the church is built upon the acknowledgment of Christ as the Son of the living God. Not simple lip acknowledgment, but the acknowledgment of obedience.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.7*

The remainder of the text will be considered next week under the heading, “The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.”*SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.8*

**“Romans 3:9-12” The Signs of the Times, 16, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

Before beginning the third chapter of Romans, we must make a very brief summary of the first two chapters, in order to get our

bearings. The first chapter, after the comprehensive salutation, tells of Paul's earnest desire to preach the gospel in Rome, because he is debtor to all men, and is not ashamed of the gospel; and this leads to the real opening of the epistle, in the statement that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, because in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith. Then we are shown the justice of God in visiting wrath upon those whose ungodliness stands in the way of God's truth, because from the things that are made they have full opportunity to know all that may be known of God. We are then told how those who once knew God lost their knowledge of him; and the depth of wickedness to which they fell is made known in few words. This closes the chapter. The second chapter opens with a scathing arraignment of all who know enough to condemn the wicked practices of the heathen, charging them with being in the same condemnation. The apostle goes on to show that none can escape the righteous judgment of God, who is no respecter of persons, but that Jew and Gentile alike must be judged according to the light that they have had; and the last half of the chapter brings the general charge contained in the beginning, directly home to the Jews, and shows that not only are they equally guilty with the Gentiles, but that they are in reality not Jews at all; by their violation of the law, their circumcision is made uncircumcision. Only those are Jews in whom there is no guile; and that only is circumcision which is of the heart.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.9*

The third chapter opens with a series of questions and answers, the questions being those which the apostle puts into the mouth of a supposed Jew, who objects to some of the positions taken in the preceeding chapters. Paul's writings. Having stated a case and proved it by positive argument, he anticipates all possible objections, and thus presents the matter in the most vivid light. Many people misinterpret his argument, by assuming that the objections which he raises are his own, instead of regarding the questions as those raised by a supposed objector, which he quotes merely for the purpose of answering them. In this case we will examine the questions and answers in detail, and then view the conversation as a whole.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.10*

The first question that arises after the apostle has stated that

disobedience makes circumcision uncircumcision, that circumcision is of the heart, and that the Gentiles who keep the law are counted as Jews and circumcised, is, "What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what profit is there of circumcision?" This is a very natural question. The apostle's answer is ready,—"Much every way; chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." *SITI August 11, 1890, page 442.11*

It will be understood that the word "circumcision" stands for the Jewish nation, as in *Galatians 2:7-9* and *Ephesians 2:11*, so that the two parts of verse 1 are really one question, and that when Paul says that unto *them* were committed the oracles of God, he means the Jews, who were "called circumcision." The "oracles of God" evidently mean the ten commandments. An oracle is a revelation or response made by the mouth of any divinity, whether heathen or not. The oracles of God are those revelations made by the mouth of God. This pre-eminently applies to the ten commandments, and then to the whole Bible as an expansion of that law. Stephen spoke of Moses as having "received the lively oracles to give unto us." *Acts 7:38*. The holy of holies in the temple was called the oracle (*1 Kings 6:19, 20*), because it was solely for the purpose of containing the ark which held the ten commandments. They are the "lively" or "living" oracles, because "the word of God is quick [living], and powerful." *Hebrews 4:12*. The law was ordained to life (*Romans 7:10*), and obedience to it secures life (*Matthew 19:17*). It is the moral representation of the living God, and is the foundation of that throne which is itself alive (*Ezekiel 1*), and out of which proceeds the river of life. *Revelation 22:1*. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.1*

To the Jews was granted the inestimable honor of being the depositaries of this law. See article entitled, "The Advantage of the Jew," pages 410, 411 of the *SIGNS OF THE TIMES* of July 14. It was a great thing to be the people chosen by the Lord to make known his truth among the nations of earth. The law was not committed to them because they were so much better than other people; but because of Abraham's faithfulness, and God's promise to him, God honored his children in a special manner. They were "beloved for the fathers' sakes." *Romans 11:28*. It was not that God had more interest in the salvation of other people, that he committed his law to them, for he is no respecter of persons, and he

loved the world; but he committed the law to them in the line of the fulfillment of his covenant with Abraham; and he showed his great desire for the salvation of other nations, by giving his chosen missionary people the prestige of all his mighty acts. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.2*

But the Jews did not appreciate the honor thus bestowed upon them. Not only did they refuse to do the work assigned them, but they neglected to keep the law themselves. For their disobedience they were delivered into the hands of their enemies, and in captivity were compelled to do that which they might have done as the honored and feared of all nations. By the godly life of some of the Jews, who in captivity were advanced to high positions, the heathen learned of the true God and his laws; and the kings Nebuchadnezzar and Darius proved themselves more worthy to be depositaries of God's law than the kings of Israel had. See *Daniel 4, and 6:25-28. SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.3*

Nevertheless God did not entirely degrade the Jews from the high position to which he had advanced them. To his servant Daniel he gave a vision in which he confirmed the promised restoration of the Jews to their own land, and assured them that from the time of the going forth of the decree of restoration, four hundred and ninety years should be allotted to the Jewish nation, in which they could prove themselves loyal to the high trust committed to them. See *Daniel 9:24-27*. This four hundred and ninety years was to cover the period of Christ's earthly ministry. But in spite of God's long-suffering kindness, the Jews proved themselves unfaithful. It is true that they never again relapsed into open idolatry; but they shut themselves up to themselves, and built a partition between themselves and those whom they should have mingled with to instruct. While making their boast in the law, through breaking it they dishonored God; and finally they filled up the measure of their iniquity by rejecting the Son of God himself. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." *John 1:11*. Still, as God had given his word, it was needful that the gospel should first be preached to them; but when they not only refused to help on the work, but judged themselves unworthy of eternal life, they were left with nothing but the memory of a wasted opportunity. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.4*

So much for the advantage of the Jew. It was necessary to devote this much space to it, for there is a widespread misunderstanding in regard to it. Comparatively few realize that it consisted chiefly in an opportunity to do good, and not in simply having good things showered upon them. If the Jews had been faithful to their trust, they would have proved that the greatest blessing that God can bestow on any people in this life is to give them an opportunity of working with and for him. E. J. W. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.5*

*(Concluded next week.)*

**“The Ten Lepers. *Luke 17:11-19*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

### **INTERNATIONAL LESSON NOTES.**

**(Luke, August 17, 1890, p. 17.)**

In the record of the healing of the ten lepers we have, as in the record of all miracles, proof of the divinity of Christ, and an aid to that faith which will give us eternal life. These miracles are recorded that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name. *John 20:31*. In this miracle we see in an especial manner the depth of the love of God, for we see it bestowed on those who had no appreciation of it. From a study of this miracle we shall receive additional proof in the Scripture that God “is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” *1 John 1:9. SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.6*

Leprosy is one of the most loathsome of diseases. It is constitutional, involving the whole system. It may be said to be a living, progressive death, in that, one after another, the different members of the body lose all sensibility, and finally drop off, the disease inevitably ending in death. It is a disease incurable by any means known to man. So loathsome is it that it forever shuts away its victim from the society of the uninfected. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.7*

In all these things it is a fitting type of sin. Sin is a constitutional

disease—a disease affecting the whole system. The Lord says to those who have departed from him, and loaded themselves with sin: “Why should ye be stricken any more? Ye will revolt more and more; the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores; they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.” *Isaiah 1:5, 6*. It is incurable by any means known to man. “Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?” *Proverbs 20:9*. “If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me; if I say, I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse.” *Job 9:20*. “For though thou wash thee with niter, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God.” *Jeremiah 2:22*. If a person is diseased in only one member, that member may be cut off, and the spread of the disease be checked in that way, if it is incurable; but when the vital organs are diseased, and the whole body is affected, there is no hope. As the leprosy separates its victims from the society of the pure, so with sin. “Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you.” *Isaiah 59:2*. It is possible, says one who has seen much of leprosy, for lepers who have means to secure such medical treatment as removes most of the external signs of the disease. So sinners may by their works outwardly appear unto men to be righteous, but within they are full of hypocrisy and iniquity, and all uncleanness. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.8*

But although the leprosy is so loathsome and so dangerous, Jesus did not fear it, not did he shrink from contact with it. “And, behold, there came a leper and worshiped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed.” *Matthew 8:2, 3*. It was not because leprosy was pleasant to Jesus that he touched the leper; we cannot suppose that it was any more attractive to him than to other people. But his love for men was so great that he would touch the leper, in spite of his loathsomeness, that he might cleanse him from it. So sin is not pleasant to the eyes of God; it is most loathsome. Even to our eyes it often appears hideous; how much more so must it seem to the pure and holy God. Nevertheless he so loved men that “he was made in all things like unto his brethren,” that he might purify

them. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 *Corinthians* 5:21. In this we may behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.9*

"He saw me ruined in the fall,  
Yet loved me, not withstanding all;  
He saved me from my lost estate;  
His loving-kindness, oh, how great!"*SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.10*

The readiness of Jesus to touch the poor leper, and the speedy cure which followed, are designed to show to us his willingness to receive sinners, and his power to cleanse from all unrighteousness.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.11*

It was not necessary, however, that Jesus should actually put forth his hand and touch the diseased person, in order to heal him. The centurion whose servant was sick of the palsy, and who begged Jesus to heal him, understood this. See *Matthew* 8:5-13. So in the case under consideration, Jesus did not touch the lepers, but healed them with a word. From the case already cited, we know that this was not because he shrank from the contact. It must be to teach us the lesson that the centurion had already learned, that Jesus can speak the word, and heal at any distance. We cannot see him; we cannot feel his physical presence; yet all power is given unto him in heaven and earth, and from the height of his sanctuary, from heaven, his dwelling-place, he can heal as well as when he was present in person.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.12*

"And they lifted up their voices, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. And when he saw them, he said unto them, Go show yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed." The command to go show themselves unto the priests was in accordance with the Mosaic law. See *Leviticus* 14:1-20. They were full of leprosy, yet they were commanded to go show themselves to the priests, as though they were cleansed. "And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed." Their faith was shown in their acting as though they were cleansed before



they had any outward evidence of it. Thus they demonstrated the two scriptures, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for" (*Hebrews 11:1*), and, "What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them" (*Mark 11:24*). Faith makes its own way. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.13*

"The steps of faith  
Fall on the seeming void, and find  
The rock beneath." *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.14*

One of the ten turned back to glorify God and gave thanks. "Whoso offereth praise," says the Lord, "glorifieth me." *Psalms 50:23*. Ten lepers were cleansed, but only one returned to give thanks. Very many blessings are lost to men through unthankfulness. The men who once knew God, yet glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, lost their knowledge of God, and their foolish heart was darkened. *Romans 1:21*. The nine lepers who returned not to give glory to God were cleansed, and God did not withdraw the healing because they did not appreciate it. "If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself." *2 Timothy 2:13*. "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." *Matthew 5:45*. Yet they could not have failed to lose much that the thankful one received. Jesus said to him, "Arise, to thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole." This seems to imply wholeness in a special sense. It can mean nothing less than healing both of body and soul. It is easy to see why there was this difference between him and the others. By their failure to give thanks, they showed that they were prompted only by a selfish desire for health. Having received health, they cared nothing for the beautiful Giver. Of course those who thought no more of the Lord than that, could not have received the fullness of divine blessing. And so we see right here what they lost by their failure to glorify God; they shut themselves away from his choicest blessing. *SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.15*

Another practical lesson may be learned from this affair. It is this, that Christ did not confine his good offices to those who had living, saving faith in him, or who would be his disciples. He "went about doing good" (*Acts 10:38*) because that was his nature. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." *2 Corinthians 5:12*. It is

the goodness of God that leads men to repentance (*Romans 2:4*); and so Christ, in the fullness of his love and goodness, went about a blessing to all. How often we read that “he was moved with compassion.” He could not see suffering without wishing to alleviate it; and so he healed all who would allow him to do anything for them. Some were drawn by his goodness to believe in him to the saving of their souls, while others forgot him. Thus it is now; but if we consider Jesus in this light, as doing good to all, and not simply to those who were or would be his disciples, and then remember that this was but a manifestation of the love of God, we shall have a higher appreciation of that love, and will the more readily incline to yield to such unselfish goodness. E. J. W.*SITI August 11, 1890, page 443.16*

## August 18, 1890

“The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we studied the first part of *Matthew 16:18*, finding out what the rock is upon which the church is built, and how we may build upon it, namely, by obeying from the heart the words of Christ, the true foundation. We have now, according to promise, to study *verse 19*; but first we must notice the statement, “and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” The word “hell,” *hades*, means the grave, as it is correctly rendered in the Revised Version. How is it that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church? The idea is not that of warfare, for gates do not fight and overcome; but gates can shut people in, and close so tightly as to prevent any that are inside from escaping, and thus prevail against them. The meaning of the text is that the gates of the grave shall not prevail against the church of Christ. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.17*

Why not?-Because it is built upon him. It is firmly fastened to him, so that the foundation and the superstructure are one. Therefore whatever befalls the foundation, must likewise come to the building. The foundation in this instance occupies the same relation to the building that the head does to the body; and whatever the head shares, the body shares with it. Where the head goes, the body goes. The members of the church are joint heirs with Christ. Now Christ announces himself as the one that liveth and was dead, but is alive forevermore, and has the keys of the grave and of death. *Revelation 1:18*. Death and the grave were not able to hold Christ. *Acts 2:24*. Therefore they cannot hold those who are built upon and united to him. Because he lives, they shall live also. This is consistent with the idea that Christ is the resurrection and the life. The grave is only an incident in the lives of those who are his; it has no power over them. But this confident language could not be used if Peter were the foundation of the church. He could not save even himself, but, like all other mortals, is dependent upon Christ for life. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.18*

“And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and

whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”*SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.19*

The first thing to consider is what constitutes the keys of the kingdom of heaven. A key is that which unlocks or locks; it is anything by which we gain access to any place, or which enables us to understand any given thing. Now what is it that opens heaven to mankind, and enables us to understand God?—Evidently the gospel, and nothing else. Paul says that Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” *2 Timothy 1:10*. Immortality stands for all heavenly blessings, as it comprises all. It is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.20*

Christ declares himself to be “he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth.” *Revelation 3:7*. In *Isaiah 55:3, 4*, we read: “Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people.” The sure mercies of David are the blessings which are assured to us through Christ, the Son of David.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.21*

While the gospel opens the kingdom of heaven to men, it also shuts out those who reject it. The apostle Paul says: “Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life.” *2 Corinthians 3:14-16*. Thus the gospel opens and shuts.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.22*

It seems plain, therefore, that when Christ said, “And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” he referred to the gospel, which he was about to commit to Peter and his associates. But how about their binding and loosing on earth, and it being bound or loosed in heaven? A text in Jeremiah will help us to understand this.

In the record of the calling of the prophet, we read: "Then the Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." *Jeremiah 1:9, 10. SITI August 18, 1890, page 443.23*

Jeremiah was only a man, yet he was clothed with wonderful power. As strong language was used concerning him as was spoken to Peter. Now how was he to root out kingdoms, and to pull down and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant them? Simply by the word of the Lord which he should speak. A prophet is simply the mouth-piece of God. He utters nothing of himself, but only as God speaks through him, and yet he maintains his individuality, so that the words are his own. It is all of man and all of God. The words of the man are also the words of God, and so whatever the man utters on earth, are the decrees of heaven. Whatever he binds or looses on earth, is bound or loosed in heaven. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.1*

It was the same with the apostles. On the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit came on them, they began to speak, with tongues, "as the Spirit gave them utterance." We have before quoted the statement of Paul, that in making known the gospel he spoke, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." *1 Corinthians 2:13*. The same word of God, which was given to Jeremiah and Isaiah, was committed to the apostles. Peter, after quoting from Isaiah the statement that "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever," adds: "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." *1 Peter 1:24, 25*. Therefore just as Jeremiah, as the spokesman for God, could tear down and build up nations, so the apostles, with the words of Christ in their mouths, could bind and loose, according to the will of heaven. The acts of men in such cases were not the acts of men, but of God. Men were simply the mouth-pieces of his righteous decrees. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.2*

But how about the words of Christ being addressed directly to

Peter? There is no question but that Peter occupied a prominent place among the apostles. He was a natural leader, and often spoke for the others. Moreover, he was a pioneer in gospel work. In the council at Jerusalem he said: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." *Acts 15:7*. But although he was the first one to preach to the Gentiles, his special work was among the Jews, as we read from Paul, concerning this same council:-*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.3*

"When they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter (for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles): .... they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." *Galatians 2:7-9*.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.4*

Here we find that a special dispensation of the gospel was committed to Peter, even as unto Paul. But this did not constitute him the sole guardian of the doors of heaven. As one to whom the gospel was specially intrusted, he did most certainly have the keys of the kingdom of heaven in his possession; but this special commission he shared with Paul, and to Paul was given the greater work. So the keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed to Paul as well as to Peter, and in a greater measure, since he "labored more abundantly than they all." *1 Corinthians 15:10*. And not only were the keys given to Peter and Paul, as pioneers in the great work of the gospel, but to all their associates, who received the same divine commission (*Matthew 28:19, 20*); and not only to the apostles, but to the prophets, who declared the word of the Lord. And so the church, which is the house of the living God, stands not upon any one man, nor upon any company of men, but "on the foundations of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," and the entire foundation. E. J. W.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.5*

**"The Day which the Lord Hath Made" The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

“This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.” *Psalms 118:24*. Does this refer to the first day of the week? There are many who assume that it does. On what grounds? -Simply these: It has become quite a common thing to call the first day of the week the Lord’s day. This custom arose long after the New Testament was written. But having given the day that title, men now claim that every reference to the Lord’s day, or to the day which the Lord made, must refer to Sunday. Thus the Bible is made to support an institution of men. There is not the slightest intimation in the psalm that any day of the week is referred to. The Lord did not make one day of the week any more than another. He made them all. Therefore it is absurd to single out any one day of the week, and say that it alone is referred to by the statement, “*This is the day which the Lord hath made.*” *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.6*

The day referred to in this verse is the “day of salvation,” in which Christ, the head stone of the corner, opens to all men “the gates of righteousness.” This day of salvation, which the Lord has made, in which he opens the gates of righteousness, is a day in which to be glad and rejoice, as the prophet says: “I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness.” *Isaiah 61:10*. Abraham saw this day, and was glad (*John 8:56*), because he received the righteousness of God, through faith in Christ. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.7*

It is true that the Lord has a day of the week that he claims as specially his own, not because he made it any more than any other day, but because he reserved it to be devoted specially to him. The Lord’s day is holy (*Isaiah 58:13*), and it is the Sabbath-day. It is the seventh day that is the Sabbath. It was for an alleged violation of that day that the Jews upbraided the disciples of Jesus, when he cleared them from the charge of Sabbath-breaking, and showed his authority to decide in the matter, by declaring that he was Lord of the day. *Mark 2:23-28*. This of itself is sufficient to show that the seventh day and that alone is the Lord’s day. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.8*

But while this is true, it is not true that on this day any more than any other day can people enter into the gates of righteousness. The Sabbath-day is to be kept holy unto the Lord; but the Lord is just as willing to forgive sins and to grant blessings on any other day as on this day. His ear is ever open to the cry of his creatures. The Sabbath is not to be kept as a bribe to induce the lord to bestow blessings, but because of love to him for his love to us in this accepted time, the day of salvation.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.9*

**“Getting Even” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

An expression that is very frequently heard among certain people is, “I’ll get even with him.” Everybody knows the circumstance which calls the expression forth. The speaker has received some slight or personal injury, at the hands of another, or has been slandered, and he determines to retaliate. He is going to give the other one “as good as he sent,” which was all bad. In other words, one person has done a mean act, and another person is going to lower himself to the same level, in order to “get even.” Isn’t it strange that people never talk about getting even except when they have to lower themselves in order to do it? Would it not be more reasonable to talk about getting even with someone who has done a good act? It is true that nothing is to be done through strife and vainglory, yet we are exhorted to “provoke one another unto love and good works,” and if that is done, it follows that it is proper to be “provoked” in that way. If we are anxious to have things even, let us do it by helping some fallen one up to the place where God’s grace may have placed us, instead of ourselves going down to a lower plane.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.10*

**“Christ Will Come” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

What is an Adventist? An Adventist is one who believes in the advent or coming of the Lord to this earth the second time. The term is specially applied to one who believes that that coming is



near. Isn't it a piece of fanaticism to think that the Lord is coming to this earth again?-Not if the Bible is the word of God. That Christ will come again is just as sure as that he once came and went away. Hear his own words: "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." *John 14:1-3.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.11*

Now it is certain that Christ did go away. Forty days after his resurrection he talked with his disciples, and renewed to them the promise of the Holy Spirit; "and when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight." *Acts 1:9*. Now listen to the words that were immediately spoken by two heavenly messengers:-*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.12*

"And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." *Acts 1:10, 11.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.13*

He was taken up, and a cloud received him out of sight; and he is coming in like manner. With this agree the words written by John: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." *Revelation 1:7.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.14*

This coming has not yet taken place. No one has seen him descending with clouds. Salvation is yet freely offered to the inhabitants of earth; but when he comes salvation will be complete. He is to come only once more, and that will end the day of salvation. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." *Hebrews 9:27, 28.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.15*

It will be utterly impossible for this coming to take place and

everybody not know it, for “every eye shall see him,” when “the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise.” *1 Thessalonians 4:16.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.16*

We have not time and space to note the signs which Christ said should precede his coming, but will only note that he expects his people to know when that coming is near. He said: “Learn a parable of the fig tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it he is near, even at the doors.” *Matthew 24:32, 33.* And the apostle Paul says, “But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.” *1 Thessalonians 5:4.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.17*

In view of these plain texts of Scriptures, is not Adventism a reasonable doctrine, and worthy of earnest, candid attention? E. J. W.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.18*

**“Resolutions Not Sufficient” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Washington correspondent of one of the New York religious weeklies writes:-*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.19*

“It is rather remarkable that while the Universal Peace Congress is holding its session in London, there is more talk of war among the nations than for some time past. Here is the outbreak of a war between Nicaragua and Guatemala, and dispatches have been received in this city stating that three more of the South American republics have united with Guatemala in an offensive alliance against Salvador. Considering that the Pan-American Congress, which adjourned but a few weeks since, passed resolutions to substitute arbitration for war, people are wondering what has become of the practical carrying out of that resolution.”*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.20*

There is nothing so very remarkable about it. Resolutions will not

change men's natures. Men may resolve to substitute arbitration for war, but that will not diminish the perilous times which the Scripture has said shall abound because men will be lovers of their own hearts. *2 Timothy 3:1, 2*. It is a significant fact that none of these arbitration resolutions are passed by the heads of governments, or by those who have any voice in the management of affairs. There will never be any end of strife in this earth until He comes whose right it is, and, gathering out of his kingdom everything that offends, casts it into a furnace of fire. *Matthew 13:40-42*. But even when this time of destruction is most imminent, men will be tickling the ears of the world by assurances of peace and safety. *1 Thessalonians 5:2, 3*. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.21*

**“Prevailing Prayer. *Luke 18:1-14*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

**INTERNATIONAL LESSON NOTES.**  
**(*Luke 18:1-14*; August 24, 1890.)**

“And he spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought alway to pray, and not to faint; saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man; and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth? And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others; two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to

me a sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." *Luke 18:1-14.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.22*

It is highly probable that a majority of those who read this simple parable fail to learn the lesson from it that they should. They look at it as though it designed to teach that the unjust judge is a type of God, which cannot by any possibility be the case. If it were, then it would poorly serve the object of encouraging men always to pray, and not to grow weary. Few persons would have the heart to hold out against oft-repeated rebuffs.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.23*

The parable was spoken in order that men might, according to the Syriac, pray at every opportunity, and not grow weary. Surely this parable would not help men to that end, if it taught that God is like the unjust judge-hard to move. There would be no encouragement in that. Such an idea does violence to the whole tenor of Scripture. Hear what the character of God is:-*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.24*

"Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." *Psalms 103:13.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.25*

"For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers." *1 Peter 3:12.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.26*

"And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." *Exodus 34:6, 7.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.27*

"Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy." *Micah 7:18.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.28*

"I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not; I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that

was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts; a people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face.” *Isaiah 65:1-3.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.29*

“Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.” *John 15:13.* “But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” *Romans 5:8.SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.30*

Add to all these the following: “Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?” *Matthew 7:9-11.* Here Christ is both compared and contrasted with earthly parents. He has the same kind of love for his children who are in need that an earthly parent has for his children, but he is infinitely greater and better, and his love for his children is as much greater than that of an earthly parent for his children, as God is greater than man. If a person, then, wishes to know how willing God is to answer prayer, let him think of his own willingness, yes, eagerness, to give his children needed things, and then multiply that degree of willingness by infinity.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.31*

Besides this, we read: “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.” *James 1:5.* He does not upbraid us because we have not asked before, nor because we have squandered that which he has previously given us; when we ask in faith, he gives freely, without taunting us with our short-comings.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.32*

Now we can readily understand the parable of the unjust judge. He was utterly hardened. He “feared not God neither regarded man.” It made no difference to him what people said about him. He was sure of his position for this life, and he had no thought of God and the future life. All he lived for was his own selfish pleasure. This poor widow had a just cause; but he knew nothing of justice, and

paid no attention to her. But she persisted; she could not rest without having her cause decided. Her life depended on it. So she kept coming again and again, until finally the judge's comfort was interfered with. So, at last, in order to get rid of her, so that he might enjoy his own pleasures undisturbed, he granted the widow's request.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.33*

"And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily." He who concludes from this that in order to get judgment from God it is necessary to plead and urge as long as the widow did the judge, in order to overcome his indifference, or to gain his attention, maligns the character of God. The parable contrasts God with the unjust judge, instead of comparing them. If the unjust judge, with his callous heart, could be moved to do justice by the importunity of the poor widow, shall not God, who delights in mercy, avenge his own loved ones? Who can doubt it.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.34*

"Though he bear long with them." The Revised Version renders this passage literally: "And he is long-suffering over them." That deepens the contrast. The unjust judge was cruel, and had no care for man; God loves his people, and is tender and compassionate with them. What a world of encouragement there is in this, to pray at every opportunity, at every time of need, and not to grow weary, thinking that God is weary of granting our request.*SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.35*

"But," says one, "I thought that we had to strive, to agonize, to enter in; that the kingdom of heaven must be taken by force." Very true; we must "pray without ceasing;" but that does not necessarily mean that we must importune forever in order to get one thing. We are not heard for our much speaking; God does not wish us to be like the heathen, who imagine that the more frantic they become in their appeals, the more likely they are to be heard. Note the difference between the prayers of the prophets of Baal, and that of Elijah. *1 Kings 18:26-29, 36, 37*. Consider the reverent calmness of the prayer of Christ at the tomb of Lazarus. *John 11:41, 42*. When we pray, we are to believe that our request is granted, and it is granted.

*Mark 11:24.* The instant Daniel began to pray to God, an angel was dispatched to give him the knowledge he desired. *Daniel 9:23; 10:12.* Circumstances, and the interests of others, of whom we may know nothing, may delay the messenger, and our faith may thus be tested; but God is not unfaithful. By the cases and the assurances put on record, we may know of a surety that if the answer is delayed, it is coming. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.36*

But having received one petition, we are just as needy. And so we must continue “instant in prayer.” We must not lose heart and become weary. Men ought to pray at every opportunity, at every time of need. This is what the Scriptures mean. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.37*

The parable of the Pharisees and the publican, which follows, emphasizes this, and shows how readily God answers prayer. It also shows what really constitutes prayer. Since the parable was spoken to those who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others, it is evident that such ones do not offer prayer acceptable to God. The one who would receive anything from God must pray “in faith, nothing wavering.” *James 1:6.* But faith does not and cannot exist in that soul that is “lifted up.” Faith is dependence on another. Faith comes to a man when self goes out. The man who trusts in himself that he is righteous cannot expect to receive anything from the Lord, because he doesn’t ask for anything. Why should he? If he has righteousness by his own works, why should he ask the Lord for it? *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.38*

This was the case with the Pharisee. He “stood”-struck an attitude-“and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are.” He prayed “with himself,” and not to God. Apparently he began by thanking God, but actually he was congratulating himself. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.39*

“And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.” He had no confidence in himself. He did not, like the Pharisee, compare himself with others, to their disadvantage; he had no thought of others, but only of himself as

the chief sinner. He used the definite article: "God be merciful to me, *the* sinner." He acknowledged his own sin, but didn't confess for anybody else. Thus he put himself directly in the class of those upon whom God delights to have mercy. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.40*

The prayer was short, but it was long enough to get all that he wanted. "I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than [instead of] the other." What had he done to secure this? He had simply trusted in the Lord. He went up to the temple a sinner; he went down to his house a righteous man; not having his own righteousness, but "that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." E. J. W. *SITI August 18, 1890, page 450.41*



## August 25, 1890

**“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among the seven abominations which the Bible says that the Lord hates, is “he that soweth discord among brethren.” *Proverbs 6:19*. It is worthy of note that the one who does this is classed with “hands that shed innocent blood,” and “a false witness that speaketh lies.” When it is remembered that a “whisperer separateth very friends,” it will be seen that what is often considered as harmless gossip is not so harmless after all. It would seem as though the Lord regards a “tale-bearer,” a “whisperer,” or a “busybody in other men’s matters,” as one of the most despicable of creatures. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.42*

The *Congregationalist* remarks that there is a decrease of the use of ear-rings by women, and thinks that it is due to something more than the caprice of fashion. It says that this “indicates a distinct advance toward greater intelligence in matters of dress and personal adornment. The long pendants hanging from the delicate lobes of the ear have entirely disappeared from view, except among the barbarous people with whom the custom originated; and one rarely finds a woman nowadays who is willing to pierce her flesh for the sake of wearing the less conspicuous studs, even if they be diamonds.” Whoever doubts this should observe closely, and he will find it a rare thing for thoughtful, intelligent, refined women to disfigure themselves by making their ears carriers of burdens. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.43*

**“Romans 3:9-12. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

The apostle continues, “For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid.” *Romans 3:3, 4*. It may be noted in passing, that the expression “God forbid” is not a correct rendering of the Greek text. “Be it not so” is a literal translation, and “not by any means” would express the meaning in

ordinary language. What the apostle claims in this question and answer, both of which are his own, is that God's promises to the Jews were not vitiated by the unbelief of some of them. The advantage of the Jew was great, because of the promises of God; and so sure are those promises that, notwithstanding the unbelief of the vast majority of the people, "all Israel" will yet be saved; for the place of the branches that were broken off because of unbelief will be filled by the alien branches which God will graft in. See *Romans 11:17-20; Ephesians 2:12, 19. SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.44*

But Paul is not content with a simple negative to the question whether the unbelief of man can nullify the promises of God. He proceeds thus to vindicate God's integrity: "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged." *Romans 3:4*. God's word is true, no matter how false man may prove. Not only so, but God alone is true, and every man is a liar, in the sense that he has gone contrary to the truth of God. Truth proceeds from God alone; there is not a truth in the world, not a thing of value, nothing that is worth knowing, that does not come from God. Every conception of truth that even to the faintest degree illuminates the darkness of any man's mind, is a spark kindled by the Almighty. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.45*

"As it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged." This is a quotation from the Septuagint Version of *Psalms 51:4*. The fact that Paul, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, quoted from the Greek Version instead of the Hebrew original, is evidence that the former expresses the sense of the latter, but in another form. "That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings" is an exact rendering of the Hebrew of *Psalms 51:4*, and not, "that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest." But what gives the casual reader trouble with *Romans 3:4* is the clause, "and mightest overcome when thou art judged." We shall see that this is perfectly in harmony with *Psalms 51:4* as rendered in the common version, "be clear when thou judgest." *SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.46*

Let us begin with the latter rendering. The idea evidently is that in the judgment God's righteousness will be made manifest. No matter

how much men may oppose themselves to God, and cast reflections on his justice, in the judgment it will appear that he is indeed true, and that everything opposed to him is a lie. Thus God will be clear when he judges. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.47*

But the very statement that he will be clear when he judges, carries with it the idea that his decisions have been called into question, and from this it is an easy transition to the idea that he himself has been brought into judgment; that his doings are on trial. And this is just what the Scriptures elsewhere represent. The forty-first chapter of Isaiah opens with a view of a court scene, and a call for silence in the court, wherein, although God himself is Judge, he and the heathen and their gods are on trial; and in *Isaiah 43:9-12* we have the idea carried out, when the nations are challenged to bring forward their proofs, and those who have seen the mighty works of God are declared to be his witnesses, testifying that he alone is Lord. In a similar sense God was on trial before the people of Israel, in the contest between Elijah and the prophets of Baal, when the verdict of the jury was unanimous in favor of God. See *1 Kings 18:19-39*. And so God's dealings with men, especially as they appear in the judgment, are in *Romans 15:4* set forth for vividness in the light of a contest between God and men, in which God gains the victory, it being seen that he alone has justice on his side. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.48*

In *Isaiah 5:3, 4* the Lord asks for the judgment of the people, saying, "And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" And thus God condescends in all his ways to submit them to the judgment of the people, and thus he educates their sense of right and wrong. Men's judgments vary now, but in the end will be fulfilled the words of God. "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." *Isaiah 45:23*. True, the wicked will thus acknowledge God's justice, to their shame; but the righteous will for very joy of heart sing, "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? For thou only art holy; for all nations shall come

and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.”  
*Revelation 15:3, 4. SITI August 25, 1890, page 450.49*

But the objector proceeds: “But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?” *Romans 3:5*. The parenthetical expression, “I speak as a man,” is thrown in to show, what we have before stated, that this is merely a human objection. The idea of the question is this: If, as is claimed, God will come out victorious in the contest, and his righteousness will stand out in bolder relief for the contrast with the unrighteousness of men, is not God unrighteous in taking vengeance on those whose unrighteousness has thus contributed to that end? This insinuation is met with another swift negative, and the counter question, “For then how shall God judge the world?” This is an answer from fact. God will judge the world; but he would not do this if there were any unrighteousness in him. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.1*

Again the objector returns to the attack, with the same objection in another and even worse form: “For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?” *Romans 3:7*. The reader will readily see the similarity between *verses 5 and 7*. It is the same idea which Paul repudiates in *Romans 6:1, 2*, that we should continue in sin that grace may abound. Taking advantage of the implied statement (*Romans 1:21*) that God simply requires men to glorify him, the objector, with the most subtle sophistry, claims that since even the wickedness of man is overruled to the praise of God, therefore it is in reality not wickedness, and the doers of it ought not to be judged as sinners. This is the modern Spiritualist ground, that evil is itself good, and that God cannot punish anybody. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.2*

Disgusted, and filled with righteous indignation at such a Jesuitical argument, the apostle breaks in, “And not rather (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say), Let us do evil, that good may come? Whose damnation if just.” *Romans 3:8*. This cannot be understood unless we read it as in the Revised Version, “And why not,” etc. The idea is plainly this: Why do you not say at once, as some slanderously affirm that we say, “Let us do evil that good may come”? The statement, “whose damnation is

just,” refers not to the slanderers, but to those who think to escape judgment for sin by counting evil for good, or doing evil that good may come. The damnation of such is evidently just, for when they say, “Let us do evil that good may come,” as the objector has in effect been saying, they convict themselves of sin. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.3*

This retort by the apostle stops the objector on that line, and he helplessly asks, “What then? Are we better than they?” This is in reality the main question at issue (see *Romans 2:17-29*), and the asking of it shows that the objector has exhausted himself, and now throws the whole matter into Paul’s hands for him to settle, which he does as follows: - *SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.4*

“No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin [see chapters 1 and 2]; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” *Romans 3:9-12. SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.5*

The remainder of this summing up of the charge against all men, will be taken up in the next article; enough has been quoted to answer the objector’s question, and to close the controversy. And now, having noted these various points in detail, we will close by giving, in a somewhat free rendering, a general view of the dialogue, so that the reader may see the argument at a glance. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.6*

*Jew*-What advantage then hath the Jew? Or what profit is there of circumcision? *Romans 3:1. SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.7*

*Paul*-Much every way; chiefly that unto them was given the privilege of being the depositaries of God’s law, and thus to be the light of the world; for even if some did not believe, their unbelief cannot by any means shake God’s promises, for God is true though every man is a liar (compare *2 Timothy 2:13*), and the judgment will vindicate him in all his ways. *Verses 2-4. SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.8*

J.-But if our unrighteousness enables men to see more plainly by contrast the righteousness of God, as they will in the judgment, is not God unrighteous if he condemns? *Verse 5.SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.9*

P.-Not by any means; for if God were unrighteous, he could not judge the world, as he certainly will do. *Verse 6.SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.10*

J.-Well, if the truth of God has been caused to stand out in bolder relief through my untruth; if my lie against the truth redounds to the praise of God, as it is said that the wrath of man shall praise him, why then should I be judged as a sinner? *Verse 7.SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.11*

P.-Why don't you say at once just what you mean, and what some slanderously report that we say, "Let us do evil that good may come"? This is just what all your talk amounts to; but all who talk that way thereby show the justness of their own condemnation.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.12*

J.-What then, are we any better than the Gentiles? *Verse 9, first part.SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.13*

P.-"No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no not one." *Verses 9-12. E. J. W.SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.14*

**"Sunday-law Argument" The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is one of the anomalies of the Sunday-law argument. Mrs. Bateham told us in her lecture that the leading railroads, in deference to public sentiment, have reduced their Sunday freight traffic fully one-third. The universal verdict, said she, is favorable to the change. The managers say that it is a financial gain to them, their employes are delighted, their patrons make no complaint about

delay in freight, and the people in the towns and villages along the lines are pleased. The managers say that the reform ought to go farther, and that not a wheel should move on Sunday. Well, then, why in the name of reason and business common sense, don't they stop Sunday traffic? If they want to do it, and the people who are concerned want them to do it, what is there to hinder them? They own their roads, and in other matters they usually do as they please; what need is there of a Sunday law in this case? Oh, says Mrs. Bateham, forgetting her admission made a minute before, they would stop if there was a law compelling all to stop, but they are afraid that somebody else will get their business. But this doesn't tally with their statement that the one-third reduction of their traffic has been a financial gain. It is a marvelous thing to us that business men should need a law to compel them to do that which they have power to do, which they want to do, which all their patrons want them to do, and which they have already demonstrated would be to their pecuniary interest. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.15*

Mrs. Bateham told us in her lecture on Monday night that the reason why France has not in the past been able to maintain a republican form of government is that she had no Sunday laws. She said that France is now seeing her mistake; the people have seen that the stability of the United States was due to its Sunday laws, and they are now vigorously agitating the question. She told us that "the maintenance of the Sabbath [Sunday] as a civil institution is an absolute necessity to the stability of any government." Such general assertions, unsupported by argument, may satisfy those who already think that a Sunday law is the panacea for all the ills that flesh is heir to; but before we accept them, we should like to have a simple historical fact explained to us. Rome existed as a republic for about five hundred years. It tolerated all religions. During this time it conquered the world, and became the strongest government that ever existed on earth. It retained its prestige under the empire for about three hundred years more. "The iron monarchy of Rome" is an apt expression of the strength of the government. All this time it had no Sunday law. Constantine came to the throne. Under his reign Rome was at the height of her glory. He enacted a Sunday law for the empire, and within a good deal less than two hundred years the Roman Empire had crumbled to pieces. Can Mrs. Bateham or any of our Sunday-law friends explain this by their

theory?*SITI August 25, 1890, page 458.16*

One of the richest things in Mrs. Bateham's talk the other night was her attempt to astonish the audience by the announcement that the District of Columbia has no Sunday law. This, she said, is a late discovery. Until quite recently the people had all supposed that the District had good Sunday laws, but when a little incident called for an investigation, they found to their great surprise that there was on the statue-books nothing but an old, obsolete, colonial law. Consequently they went to work immediately to remedy this grave defect, and the Breckinridge bill was the result. Of its ignominious failure she said nothing, but expressed confidence that the next Congress would give the District a Sunday law. But what impressed us the most forcibly in her remarks was the fact that the people had got along so well for a hundred years without any Sunday law, and were perfectly happy until they found that they didn't have one. Then they couldn't rest. Isn't it terrible? Just think what a loss the District of Columbia has sustained all these years in not having a Sunday law, and no one was conscious of it! It has been in the condition of the man upon whom the Irish coroner rendered the verdict, "Dead, but not conscious of the fact."*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.1*

One would naturally suppose that those whose whole life is devoted to the securing of Sunday laws, both State and national, would know all about the working of such laws in the past. Yet Mrs. Bateham, in her second lecture in Oakland, said that no trouble had ever yet resulted from Sunday laws, except in one or two cases in Missouri, where a mistake was made; although it is a matter of national report that, in Arkansas, there have been scores of cases of persecution, as also in Tennessee, and that in the latter State one man has been convicted and fined twice for the same act, and his case is now in the courts. One old man was imprisoned for months, to the lasting injury of his health, and in Georgia a man lost his life from exposure in prison. Shall we charitably conclude that the ignoring of such facts as these is due to pure ignorance?*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.2*

Last Friday evening Mrs. Bateham delivered a second lecture in Oakland, to an audience of forty-two. She told us, immediately after



the reading of *Genesis 2:1-3*, that the original Sabbath was the first day and not the seventh; that Adam's first Sabbath was the first day of the week, because "we always count time from the beginning of man's life;" that God gave the Jews the seventh day as their especial day, going back to the first day at the cross; that the fourth commandment is indefinite, requiring no special day, but only a seventh day after any six days of labor; that whether we believe that Saturday or Sunday is the Sabbath, we can all come together on this common ground, and so can work together for a Sunday law; that "a seventh day" will not satisfy the demands of a Sunday law, but it must enforce a definite day; and finally, that time has been lost, especially by the dropping out of ten days at the changing of the calendar, so that we can't tell anything about the days of the week, and that it is impossible for everybody to keep the same day anyhow. All of which was respectfully submitted to a presumably intelligent audience. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.3*

**"N. R. J.' and the 'Civil Sabbath'" The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

Editor SIGNS OF THE TIMES: As copied into the *American Sentinel* of July 21, I have this day read your criticism of my letter to the *Christian Statesman* of May 15. Will you admit a few lines in my own defense? For I think you misunderstand me. I am sure your readers will if they did not read my letter in the *Statesman*. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.4*

1. I do not believe in a "civil Sabbath" in the sense in which you use the words. I never have said that a "civil Sabbath," is all that I favor. I differ entirely from the majority of the California people, who ask a Sunday law merely as a police or sanitary regulation. From the first of Rev. Mr. Crafts' coming here, and all the time, I have most decidedly objected to his theory of a "civil Sunday." In the *Christian Statesman* I wrote against it; and it was because of my objection to the "civil Sunday" that I wrote what I did about the action of the State Prohibition Convention. I finally reject the secular theory of government and of education alike. Others wish only a "civil Sunday;" I wish the Sabbath of the Lord our God, the Institutor of it. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.5*

2. The only authority we have for the observance of a sabbath-the only power that has any right to require a seventh portion of time to be observed as sacred to rest and to worship, whether it be a seventh-day or a first-day Sabbath-is the divine Lawgiver, whose will is declared in the law of the fourth commandment. Neither Church nor State has any right to make law about a Sabbath. "The Sabbath was made [*i.e.*, appointed] for man." God appointed it. Governments or Legislatures have no power except to recognize it as God's law, binding upon the people, and to see that the law which forbids work be not trampled underfoot by open transgressors.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.6*

3. God is the author of all moral law. He is the source of all authority. "There is no power but of God." Governments may only find out law, the divine law, and accept and codify it as the law by which the people must be governed. Especially do governments have nothing to do in legislation in the department of religion. Governments only sphere is in civil matters.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.7*

4. The law of the fourth commandment is partly religious and partly civil. It commands religious duties: It also commands civil duties. "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant.... nor thy stranger that is within thy gate; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as them." That is *civil* law. Government should protect men in the enjoyment of their right. The right to rest as God requires, belongs to a servant. If the master does not grant the right to an employe, he is a transgressor of law. Government must protest the wronged. God requires it. Government is his agent. Thus government may legislate as to the enforcement of God's civil law for the protection of men in the enjoyment of God-given rights. Thus far I am in favor of a "civil Sabbath." Am I understood?*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.8*

5. "Thou shalt not steal" is a moral, civil law. Governments have no power to either reject it or to modify it. The same is true of the fourth commandment. Except by moral restraints or motives the church has no power to prevent work on the Sabbath. But a law without a penalty is no law at all. Therefore, civil government is the only and

the proper power to punish the open transgression of God's civil law. Thus far I am in favor of a civil Sabbath law. But remember that the permission or obligation to legislate about Sabbath observance is derived wholly from God. Men or governments have no such authority. The religious obligation is the only one existing: *i.e.*, we should have Sabbath laws only because God requires them and for man's good. And the principle I advocate is applicable whether the first or the seventh day should be kept holy. Which is the true Sabbath is not the question here and now. I honor the convictions of those who conscientiously believe in the seventh-day Sabbath; for I beg leave to say that I do not believe in "only a civil Sabbath." I am not in favor of "only a civil Sunday law." I prefer the fourth commandment; and the people, the church, and the State that permit it to be trampled underfoot by lawless desecrators are false to God and to humanity. Yours for the truth and the right. *SITI*  
*August 25, 1890, page 459.9*

N. R. JOHNSTON.

We give place to the above letter of explanation, not alone as an act of courtesy to a very estimable gentleman, with whom we enjoy a pleasant acquaintance, but also for the special benefit of the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. Mr. Johnston is an honorable member of the National Reform Association. He was secretary of one of the early national conventions of that organization, and is a regular contributor to the *Christian Statesman*. Therefore when we read a statement from him, we feel that we read the thoughts of the National Reform Association. We shall doubtless have occasion to make frequent reference to that body in the future, and those of our readers who treasure up this letter will know, as well as anyone can know, what its principles are on the Sunday question. We will now offer a few words of comment on the letter, section by section. *SITI*  
*August 25, 1890, page 459.10*

1. We wish that all Sunday-law people stood where Mr. Johnston does, and would as frankly avow their belief in, and desire for, a law from a religious standpoint. We are sure that this is where they all stand, in heart; but repeated defeats on that line have taught many to conceal their real sentiments by pleading for a merely "civil Sunday." With the exception of the statement, "I totally reject the

secular theory of government and of education alike,” there is nothing in section No. 1 that we could not heartily second. We also “wish the Sabbath of the Lord our God,” not, however, enforced by civil authority. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.11*

But by the above phrase Mr. Johnston means Sunday, which is not the Sabbath of the Lord our God. “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” *Exodus 20:10*. It was such as late as the time when Christ was on earth, and when the New Testament was written. See *Mark 2:23-28*. If the Lord has changed the day of his Sabbath, it has been done since his revelation was given to man, and we should like to know where the record of the change is, and to whom he committed it. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.12*

2. With the exception of the last sentence, we most emphatically say, “Good!” to section 2. But to the statement that it is the province of Legislatures to recognize God’s law as binding on the people, and to see that it is not trampled underfoot, we offer a most emphatic protest. That would be a union of Church and State, for it is simply a partnership between God and the State, by the terms of which the Lord is to enact the laws, and the State is to enforce them. This is just the same as a partnership in which one party furnishes the capital and the other does the work. God has not relegated to any inferior power the right or authority to enforce his laws. To think that he “that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers,” before whom all nations “are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity” (*Isaiah 40:22, 17*), should intrust the execution of his laws to those same comparatively insignificant creatures, is an insult to common sense, to say nothing of revelation. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.13*

It is a misapprehension of the fourth commandment, to assume that it simply forbids work on the Sabbath-day. Paul says that “the law is spiritual.” If it is not spiritual, it is nothing. Just what the fourth commandment does forbid is shown by its Author in *Isaiah 58:13*: “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words,” etc.

Now if civil government takes it upon itself to see that men do not “trample underfoot” the fourth commandment, it must see that they do not speak their own words on the Sabbath-day. A difficult task it would be, yet as difficult a task was undertaken by the Inquisition. Only the Inquisition could determine to any degree whatever whom to punish for violation of the fourth commandment. God never established the Inquisition, but a National Reform government could not be carried on without it; therefore God has nothing to do with National Reform.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.14*

3. A queer mixture is in this paragraph. Governments have nothing to do with religion, yet they must codify and enforce divine law! Since God is the moral Governor, and human governments are to enforce his decrees, yet are to have nothing to do with religion, we may ask, Whence, then, comes religion? But why should the law of God need to be codified by human legislators? Is it not sufficiently clear and concise? The idea that poor, weak, fallible mortals can codify the laws of the Omnipotent Ruler of the universe, which were spoken by his own voice, and engraved in the flinty rock with his own finger, is too monstrous an assumption to be amusing. To codify is to epitomize; to arrange or systematize; to make an orderly collection or compendium of. It is a long step in advance of having the same thing loosely arranged. Therefore since the National Reform government would codify the laws of God, it must be a legitimate successor of that power that “opposeth and exalteth itself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped.”*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.15*

4. Yes, you are understood quite well. “The law of the fourth commandment is partly religious and partly civil!” We have often heard the claim made, and now propose to place it by the side of one text of Scripture. “For we know that the law is spiritual.” *Romans 7:14*. Can you say that, Brother Johnston? or have you information of a later date than Paul’s? That cannot be, for he spoke by inspiration that which he had learned from God himself; and God does not change. Facts cannot change. If the law was spiritual in Paul’s day, it is spiritual still, not partly spiritual and partly something else. The idea that the moral law is partly civil is a modern invention, conjured up by presumptuous, self-seeking men, as an excuse for their attempt to divide honors with the Almighty. In

saying this, we mean no disrespect to Mr. Johnston. Even the apostle Barnabas was once unsuspectingly carried away by dissimulation.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.16*

But, Brother Johnston, you say in paragraph one that you don't want a civil Sunday law; you are frank in your avowal of a desire for a Sunday law from a religious standpoint; then why the reference to the supposed civil features of the fourth commandment as an aid to your plea? Why detract from its complete and perfect morality, and make it partly secular, when you don't want a secular Sunday law? We can answer. It is because nobody can argue for Sunday laws without involving himself in hopeless inconsistencies.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 459.17*

If the reference to "gates" in the fourth commandment be construed as referring to city gates, then the whole commandment must be considered as addressed to the government, and not to the individual. But it is actually addressed individually to every man. Each man is to keep the Sabbath; his son and his daughter must likewise keep it; his man-servant and his maid-servant must also keep it; and also the stranger within his gates. That is, all who are upon the man's premises must keep the Sabbath, because if they worked, it would be the same as if he worked.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.1*

It is true that government must protect a man in the enjoyment of God-given rights; but that does not signify that it must force a man to accept that which he does not regard as a right, but which he thinks is positively wrong. Protection and compulsion are widely different. Government must protect the wronged. If a servant wishes to keep Sunday, and his employer by force and power compels him to work, then he may appeal to the law for protection, and so may any man who is forcibly deprived of his liberty. But we must confess that we have never heard of such a case since the abolition of slavery. In these days when employ es strike for the most trivial causes, and almost every laborer belongs to some organization which assumes the right to dictate to the employer just how far he may go in any case, it is sheer nonsense to talk of men being compelled to work on Sunday against their will.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.2*

5. In this section we have the climax. “Thou shalt not steal” is a moral civil law.” The Bible knows nothing of any such mongrel. “The law is spiritual.” It is wholly spiritual. He who keeps it only outwardly does not keep it at all. Read the Saviour’s dissertation on the law, in *Matthew 5:19-28*, and his denunciation of hypocrites, in *Matthew 23:25-28*. Thousands of men who have never been guilty of any act of which the State could take notice, have lived in daily violation of the eighth commandment, as well as the seventh, and others. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.3*

But what shall we say to this: “But a law without a penalty is no law at all. Therefore, civil government is the only and the proper power to punish the open transgression of God’s civil law,” which is the *moral* law of ten commandments. God says, “Vengeance is mine; I will repay;” but National Reform says that God hasn’t the power, and that if human governments do not administer the penalty, sin must go unpunished. Christ says that God has given the Son authority to execute judgment, and that he will do this when he comes from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire (see *John 5:27*; *2 Thessalonians 1:7-9*); but National Reform says that human governments must execute judgment now, or else the sinner will go free. Could any worse insult to the majesty of Jehovah be invented? Mr. Johnston is a minister of the gospel, and we know that he is personally devout and reverent; therefore we feel the more astonished that he should champion a cause which puts man above God; yea, which sets man on the throne of judgment, and relegates God to obscurity. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.4*

We have studied brevity in noticing these points, for our space is limited; but we trust that all the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES can see that opposition to Sunday laws, and to the theory which underlies them, is not simply a matter of protesting against a possible injustice to a few men. It is a religious duty incumbent on everyone who has any regard for the honor of God. Human government is secular, and only secular; that is, it pertains wholly to this world and to worldly affairs. God is the only moral governor; his government is the only moral government; his law is the only moral law; and it is wholly moral. With it man has nothing to do but to obey it. The duty of the king is identical with that of the humblest subject. Both are alike answerable to God, and to him alone, for violation of

it. So broad are its requirements, that no one can keep them except through the grace of Christ; no one can boast over another; and no one can get beyond simple, personal obedience to it, so that he can act as an overseer to his fellows. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.5*

To those who assume to exercise the prerogatives of God, he will say at the last day, "Who hath required this at your hands?" and like the man in the parable, they will be speechless; for "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." E. J. W. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.6*

**"Entering the Kingdom. *Luke 18:15-30*" The Signs of the Times, 16, 33.**

E. J. Waggoner

## **INTERNATIONAL LESSON NOTES.**

**(*Luke 18:15-30*; August 31, 1890.)**

*Verses 15-17* relate the bringing of children to Jesus, the rebuke of the disciples, and his call for children to come to him. There is not in this, as is sometimes assumed, the slightest hint of infant baptism. Infants that have not come to an age where they can understand right and wrong for themselves, are special subjects of God's favor. By virtue of Christ's sacrifice they share in the universal redemption from the death which results from their being descendants of Adam. They do not have to be baptized in order to be made alive from this death, for that is promised to the wicked as well as to the good. But being made alive from this death, they cannot suffer the death which is the penalty of sin, for they have never had personal guilt. Consequently they are saved by God's grace, the same as all who are saved, but without baptism, for it is impossible for them to comply with the conditions of baptism; they can neither believe nor disbelieve. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.7*

Since God is so merciful toward the infants, it naturally follows that he will gladly receive the children who come to him voluntarily, no matter how young they may be. When we say there is no authority for infant baptism, we do not say that sometimes very young children may not properly be baptized. As soon as a child is old



enough to believe in Christ, it is old enough to be baptized. And that children are capable of understanding and accepting the gospel, yea, that they can understand and receive more readily than adults, is shown by *verse 17*: “Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.” He does not say that children are to receive the kingdom as old people, but that all are to receive it as children. This does not mean that people must become childish, but that they must have the simple, trusting faith of children. The belief of children is made the model. It is strange that, in the face of such a scripture as this, any should ever question the propriety of receiving into the church children who give evidence of a knowledge of Christ.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.8*

“And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, that is, God.” This was not a modest disclaimer on the part of Christ of the epithet “good.” He did not mean to imply that he was not good, for that would have been to deny himself. Says the psalmist, “He is my Rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him.” *Psalms 92:15*. Peter says that he “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” *1 Peter 2:22*. Paul says that he “knew no sin.” *2 Corinthians 5:21*. John says, “And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.” *1 John 3:5*. He was absolute goodness personified, for it is in him that we are to be made the righteousness of God. *2 Corinthians 5:21*. Then what must he have meant when he said to the young ruler, “Why callest thou me good?” Simply this, that he himself was God. “The Word was God,” and “the Word was made flesh.” *John 1:1, 14*. At the very outset Jesus took advantage of the young man’s form of expression to let him know that he was standing in the presence, not of a pious Jewish rabbi, but of divinity in the form of humanity. He took this striking way of intimating to the ruler that the one whom he was asking what he should do to inherit life, was the author of life, the one who had it to bestow, and who could therefore answer his question with authority.*SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.9*

The narrative in Matthew is a little more complete than in Luke. We quote from the former. Jesus, having incidentally shown his high

position and authority, as we have seen, answered the young man's question thus: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." *Matthew 19:17*. Passing by for the moment the answer of Jesus, we note the young man's reply. "He saith unto him. Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Honor thy father and thy mother; and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up; what lack I yet?" *Verse 18-20. SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.10*

In view of the last statement made by the young man, the question, "Which?" was a most natural one. When Christ said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," there was no doubt in the young man's mind as to what was meant. Every Jew was instructed in the law, and this young man was a ruler. But he was struck with astonishment that Christ should use such language to him, who prided himself on his obedience to the law. His question, "Which?" was almost equivalent to a challenge to Christ to tell him what he ought to do that he had not done. He in reality thought that he lacked nothing. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.11*

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." They are the rule of life, and will be the standard in the judgment. "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*. And since the commandments are to be the standard of character in the judgment, it follows that everyone whose character is in harmony with them will have eternal life. So we read, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." *Revelation 22:14*. This was the condition of eternal life from the beginning. See *Deuteronomy 11:26, 27; 30:15-19. SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.12*

But if this is the condition of eternal life, and the young man had kept all the commandments from his youth up, how could it be that he lacked anything to enable him to inherit eternal life? This is just the point; he hadn't kept them. Christ tested him on the last, which

really underlies the whole. Said he, "Sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." This test the ruler could not endure. He loved wealth more than he loved God; he loved this world more than the next. He did not love his neighbor as himself, and he had other gods beside the one God. While rendering outward obedience to all the commandments, he had unconsciously been breaking them all in spirit. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.13*

The one thing lacing in his case was to follow Christ. Jesus did not mean that he should add following him to obedience to the commandments, for, as we have seen, he had not kept the commandments. The one thing lacking to a perfect obedience to the commandments was to was to follow Christ, without whom nothing can be done. Eternal life can be had only on condition of keeping the commandments; but no one can keep the commandments without Christ. So Christ is the one thing needful. Having him, we have everything. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.14*

The young man was one of the Jews who had followed after the law of righteousness, but who had not attained unto righteousness, because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. *Romans 9:31, 32*. Without faith it is impossible to please God. *Hebrews 11:6*. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." *Romans 10:4*. This does not mean that he puts an end to the law, for he himself declares that the law is the test of fitness to enter heaven. But in him the end of the law, which is righteousness and peace (see *Isaiah 48:18*), is found; for "he is our peace," and we are "made the righteousness of God in him." And so we have "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" inseparably joined together. Neither can exist without the other. There can be no keeping of the commandments outside of Christ (*John 15:5; Hebrews 11:6*), and whoever is united to Christ will keep the law, for Christ is the personification of the righteousness of God. *SITI August 25, 1890, page 460.15*

## September 1, 1890

**“The Original Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

In view of the agitation of the Sunday question, and the attempt to base Sunday laws upon the Bible, it is well for all to be thoroughly informed as to what the Bible does say about the Sabbath. Nor is this so difficult a matter as many suppose. They listen to some Sunday-law lecturer, who glibly repeats over a series of statements about the Sabbath, which he has culled from some book, and which he has no idea of proving, and they become bewildered, and say, “It is no use for us to try to settle this matter; if teachers of theology are so disagreed, how can we hope to understand it?” Now we do not blame them for becoming discouraged from trying to understand what men say about the Sabbath; but what the Bible says is so simple that a child could not become confused by it. It is true that there are some things in the Bible that are hard to be understood. The doctrines of election, and foreordination, and predestination, may require much hard study in order to be understood; but it is a fact that all those difficult subjects do not involve practical duty. A man may be a good Christian, and still be unable to make any statement in regard to them. But everything which involves a practical duty is very plain. It does not require that a person shall be highly educated to know what murder is, and that it is wrong. A man need not take a college course to understand how to be honest; and a man who does not know the multiplication table may know what would be a violation of the ninth commandment as well as a man who can measure the distances of the stars. So it is with the fourth commandment. It enjoins upon all the observance of the Sabbath, and therefore it is so plain that the most ignorant can understand it. Let us see what the Bible says about it.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 460.16*

Going back to the very beginning, we read the account in *Genesis 2:1-3*: “Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God had ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and

sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” That is the record of the making of the Sabbath.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 460.17*

How was it made? God rested, blessed, and sanctified, or set apart, the day. What day did he rest upon, bless, and set apart?-The seventh day. Which seventh day?-The seventh day of the week, for that is the only period of time consisting of seven days. It is the Sabbath which marks the week. According to the inspired narrative, the first six days of time were spent in the work of creating the heavens and earth and all that they contain; and the creation week was completed by a day of rest.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 460.18*

For whom was the Sabbath made? Jesus said, “The Sabbath was made for man.” *Mark 2:27*. Of what day of the week was he speaking?-Of the seventh day, the day which the Jews then kept, and which they have always observed. The Pharisees had charged his disciples with violating the Sabbath. Jesus cleared them from that charge, and claimed for himself the high honor of being Lord of the Sabbath,-the very Sabbath which the Jews held as sacred. That showed his ability to decide what was and what was not Sabbath-breaking.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 460.19*

But now the claim comes in that the Sabbath which the Jews kept was another day from the original Sabbath. This is the sum of a book which Dr. Briggs, of California, wrote on the Sabbath. His statement is that in the beginning God sanctified the day which we now call Sunday, but that the people so perverted it and devoted it to the worship of the sun, that he had to give the Jews a fresh day, uncontaminated by heathen worship, when he took them from Egypt. Accordingly he gave them the day before, which was their Sabbath until the crucifixion, when the calendar was slipped forward another notch, and the original Sunday was given to the people. This theory the doctor says he has arrived at by “much study, *self-searching*, and close thinking.” We don’t doubt it; but if he had searched the Bible instead of himself, he would not have broached so baseless a theory.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.1*

Now note how quickly such fog vanishes before the sunlight of

truth. We will allow that the Sabbath was given to the Jews at the exodus. This does not indicate that they did not have it before, any more than the fact that God made himself known to them at that time indicates that he was previously unknown. How did he make the Sabbath known to them? Listen to Nehemiah's inspired prayer: "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." *Nehemiah 9:13, 14*. He made known the Sabbath upon Sinai. Now the only thing spoken on Sinai in regard to the Sabbath was the fourth commandment, which reads thus:*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.2*

"Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." *Exodus 20:8-11.SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.3*

What day was declared from Sinai to be the Sabbath?-"The seventh day," the very day that in the beginning was made the Sabbath. God simply declared anew an old truth. He did not say that from that time the seventh day should be the Sabbath, but that "the seventh day *is* the Sabbath." How did it become such? For answer he repeats just what we have recorded in *Genesis 2:1-3*, that in six days the Lord made all things, and then rested upon the seventh day, which thus became the Sabbath; and then it was blessed and set apart as the Sabbath for man.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.4*

The original Sabbath, therefore, from creation, was the same day that it was from the exodus to the cross. And the same day that was the Sabbath during Christ's earthly ministry continued to be the Sabbath for all time afterwards. The Bible knows no other Sabbath. Did the reader ever stop to think that the very day that the Jews kept is throughout the New Testament called the Sabbath? "Oh," says someone, "the writers of the New Testament were Jews, and

would naturally use language that they were accustomed to.” No such thing. The writers of the New Testament were Christians; they wrote for Christians. Not only so, but they did not write their own words. The apostle Paul throws light upon the source of their words and teaching, when he says:-*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.5*

“Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” *1 Corinthians 2:12, 13. SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.6*

The Holy Spirit, then, is the source of the words of the Bible. The names which it gives to things are the names which God designs that they shall bear. Now everywhere in the New Testament the seventh day is by the Holy Spirit called the Sabbath; and this was all written years after the crucifixion. The Holy Spirit called it so because it was so. Therefore the conclusion is self-evident, that the same day which was the Sabbath ever since. This is plainly revealed; and “those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.” E. J. W.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.7*

**“No Justification by the Law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

“What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that

every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” *Romans 3:9-20.SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.8*

As we said in our last article, the first part of this passage, down to *verse 18*, is an answer to the last question raised by the Jewish objector: “What then? Are we better than they?” These verses bring us to the point where the apostle completes the foundation of his argument, and is ready for the climax. We have seen that the first chapter relates to the degradation of the heathen; the second chapter shows the Jews to be in the same condemnation; and in the verses just quoted, the apostle quotes scripture after scripture to corroborate his statements concerning both classes. We need not go into the niceties of the signification of the different terms employed; the charge is plain enough for all to understand. Only two clauses claim special attention.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.9*

“And the way of peace have they not known.” This is in harmony with the previous statement, “They are all gone out of the way.” It is evident that the way from which they have departed is the way of peace. Now what is the way of peace? Let the Bible answer. The Lord says, “O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! Then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea.” *Isaiah 48:18*. Says the psalmist, “Great peace have they which love thy law; and nothing shall offend them.” *Psalms 119:165*. Disobedience to the law which governs the universe, is rebellion against God, as he said to Isaiah: “Now go, write it before them in a table, and not it in a book, that it may be for the time to come forever and ever; that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord.” *Isaiah 30:8, 9*. When men cease their rebellion, and lay down their arms, there is peace; so there can be nothing but peace when men yield to the commandments of God.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.10*

The way of peace, from which men have departed, is God’s way, and he says to sinful men: “My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways,



and my thoughts than your thoughts.” *Isaiah 55:8, 9*. That is, the ordinary plane of men’s thoughts and actions is as much lower than the plane of God’s thoughts and actions, as expressed in his law, as the earth is lower than the highest heaven. This is important to bear in mind while reading *verses 19 and 20*. *SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.11*

“Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law,” or within the sphere of the law. We will not take time at this point to explain the phrase “under the law,” because the term is really not found in this place. There is a vast difference between the Greek here translated “under the law” and that which is properly so rendered in *Romans 6:14*, and .... Here the meaning is strictly “in the law” the Greek being the same as in *Romans 2:12-15*. “As many as have sinned *in the law*.” The meaning of the phrase “in the law,” in *Romans 2:12-15* was seen to be, *having the law*, that is, the written law, in distinction from those who have the written revelation. The statement that the law speaks to those who have it, is very plain, but as in *Romans 2:12-15* it was shown that none are really without law, but that those who are spoken of as without law are in the law only to a less degree than those that have written revelation, so it is here. For mark:-*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.12*

“What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under in the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” *SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.13*

Now it is evident that the law cannot condemn any who are not within its jurisdiction. A law peculiar to England cannot declare a citizen of the United States guilty, even though he does the things which it forbids. But the consequence of what the law of God says, is the world stand guilty before him; therefore the law of God speaks to every man in the world. *SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.14*

This nineteenth verse of the third chapter of Romans stands as a perpetual bar to the limiting of God’s law to the Jewish nation. It proves that that law is world-wide in its requirements. By it both Jew and Gentile are proved to be under sin. It was spoken to the Jews,

it is true, but only that they might in turn speak it to the Gentiles; and if they failed in their duty in this respect, then the Gentiles would perish in their iniquity, and their blood would be required at the hands of those to whom the message of truth was given. See *Ezekiel 33:2-8; Romans 2:12.SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.15*

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.”*SITI September 1, 1890, page 466.16*

This is the grand conclusion of the apostle’s argument, so far as the law alone is concerned in its relation to sinful men. It is so reasonable that anybody can see it, and so just that no one ought to lay anything to the charge of the law, on account of it. It is a fact that every soul, both of Jews and Gentiles, is guilty before God. Now what can the law do? Can it justify them? To justify means to make righteous, or to declare righteous. But they are not righteous, therefore the law cannot say that they are. If it did, it would not be a good law. The fact that it will not justify sinners-will not declare them righteous-is a standing proof that it is good. So, instead of burying the law because it will not justify sin for us, we should applaud it.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.1*

Neither can the law make a sinner righteous. No law can do that, any more than a guideboard can carry a person in the direction which it points. The law says, Do, and thou shalt live. The law speaks; it is the province of the man to do. If he does what the law says, it will witness to his righteousness; if he does not do what the law say, it will declare him guilty. It can do no more nor less. But no man has done the law, therefore none can be justified by it. Thus we see that there is no conflict between *Romans 2:13* and *Romans 3:20.SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.2*

A doer of the law is one who has always done it. If a man has failed in only one particular, he cannot be called a doer of the law, for the simple reason that he hasn’t done it all. Therefore on this account he can never be justified by the law. But what is more, the law of God is so holy, so broad and high in its requirements, that no fallen man can ever attain to its full measure. Remember that we are now speaking of fallen man alone, in his relation to the law. Therefore,

while the law is the expression of the righteousness of God, which men are commanded to seek, it is a fact that no man can get any righteousness out of it. His best efforts come short of the high standard which the law sets, and just to the extent that they fall short are they sinful. We may not say that the law condemns a man for his best deeds, but it is true that it condemns him for that which he fails to do even with his best efforts. And so it is a fact that the best efforts that any unaided human being can put forth to attain to the righteousness of the law, will really result in adding to his condemnation, as they add to the sum of his failures.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.3*

Who, then, can be saved? A vast multitude which no man can number. But how will they attain the necessary righteousness, since the law, which is the expression of God's righteousness, will not impart any to them? The problem is solved in the next few verses of the third chapter of Romans, a consideration of which must be deferred till the next article.*SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.4*

#### **"Throughout Their Generations" The Signs of the Times, 16, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

We are told that God never intended that Gentiles should have anything to do with the Sabbath; that it was made only for the Jews. This text is quoted: "Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." *Exodus 31:16, 17. SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.5*

Well, one thing is certainly proved by this text, and that is that it is right for Israelites to keep the seventh-day Sabbath. The words "throughout their generations," "perptual," and "forever" show that so long as there are generations of Israelites, they must observe the Sabbath. We pass by for the present the statement that "Gentile Christians" are not under obligation to keep the seventh day. Be that as it may, it is certain that Jews are in duty bound by the unalterable command of God to keep the seventh day.*SITI*

*September 1, 1890, page 467.6*

But here we are reminded that the promises of God are all to Israel. See *Romans 9:4*. Those who are “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,” have no hope, and are “without God in the world.” *Ephesians 2:12*. It is Israel that is to be “saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation.” *Isaiah 45:17*. And not only a part, but “all Israel shall be saved.” *Romans 11:26*. True, many who are Gentiles will be saved, but it will not be as Gentiles; they must be grafted into the stock of Israel. To be a Jew indeed is to be one who has praise of God. *Romans 2:29*. So desirable is the position, that even many who are of this “synagogue of Satan” will falsely claim to be Jews. *Revelation 3:9*. It is with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that the redeemed from all nations are to sit down in the kingdom of God, and they will do so as children of Abraham. See *Matthew 8:11*; *Galatians 3:20*. *SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.7*

Now since Christians are those who are Christ's, and all who are Christ's are Abraham's seed, it follows that all Christians are Israelites, for the promise to Abraham was through Isaac and Jacob. And since the children of Israel are commanded to keep the Sabbath “throughout their generations,” it follows that the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is especially enjoined on Christians. And since Israel is to be saved with an everlasting salvation, it follows that their generations are to continue throughout eternity; and so “it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord.” *Isaiah 66:23*. *SITI September 1, 1890, page 467.8*

## September 8, 1890

**“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

How many Christians think when they engage in the celebration of the Lord's Supper that it touches both advents of Christ? Paul says: "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death *till he come.*" *1 Corinthians 11:26*. To the man who does not believe in the second coming of Christ, the celebration of the Lord's Supper cannot mean anything. Do you say that it is even to such a one an emblem of Christ's death? Of what use is it to celebrate his death, if he be not coming the second time to complete the work of redemption? He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification, and to those who look for him he will appear again, for their salvation. The death and resurrection of Christ are really a pledge that he will come again; for Christ's resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of all who are his, and the resurrection of the dead cannot take place till he comes. See *1 Corinthians 15:51-54; 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17*. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 467.9*

**“How Righteousness Is Obtained” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

"But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justified of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is he the

God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also; seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.” *Romans 3:21-31.SITI September 8, 1890, page 467.10*

After reading the above, read thoughtfully the preceding verses of the chapter, in order that the connection may be kept. Remember that the main point already made in the chapter is that all men-both Jews and Gentiles-have sinned in the sight of God; all are amenable to the law of God, and all are condemned by it; and therefore it is impossible for any to be justified by it. It cannot declare those righteous who have broken it, and its requirements are so pure and lofty that no fallen man has strength to fulfill them. Therefore no man can obtain any righteousness by the law; and yet without holiness-perfect conformity to the law-no man can see the Lord. *Hebrews 12:14*. But some will see the Lord (see *Revelation 22:3, 4*), therefore they must get holiness in some other way than by the law. How this can be is the problem, since the law is the complete and perfect expression of the righteousness of God. The scripture at the head of this article solves the problem. Let us note it carefully.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 467.11*

“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested.” Ah! That gives hope. But, hold! Are we not in danger of being led astray? Dare we trust in a righteousness that is obtained apart from the law? Well, since we can’t get anything from the law itself, we shall have to get it apart from the law if we have any at all. But don’t be alarmed, for remember that this righteousness which we are to get without or apart from the law, is “the righteousness of God.” Why, that’s just what the law is! Exactly; there can be no real righteousness that is not the righteousness of God, and all that righteousness is set forth in his law. Where and how we are to get it we shall see presently; but note first that it is “witnessed by the law and the prophets.” It is such righteousness as the law will give its sanction to. Now where is it to be obtained?*SITI September 8, 1890, page 467.12*

“Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.” And so we have the

strongest evidence that we shall not be put to shame before the law, if we can only obtain this righteousness. For we know that Christ, as part of the Godhead, is equal with the Father. He is the Word, and is God. As the Word, the manifestation of Him whom no man hath seen, he spoke the law with his own voice. He spoke it "as one having authority," "for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Therefore if we get the righteousness of God through Jesus Christ, it is evident that we shall have the righteousness which the law requires, because we get it from the Fountain-head. Our righteousness comes from the same source that the righteousness of the law does.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 467.13*

How do we get it?-By faith. How else could we get it? Since it is impossible for any to get righteousness by the deeds of the law, it is evident that it must come by faith, as a gift. And this is in keeping with the statement that "the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Someone says that it doesn't seem possible that we could get righteousness in this way. But think a moment; "sin" and "righteousness" simply denote our relation to God. Now if there is a way by which he can, consistently with his justice, count us righteous, he has a right to. Who shall say that he may not do what he will with his own?*SITI September 8, 1890, page 467.14*

"God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 *Corinthians* 5:19. In giving his only begotten Son for the world, it was the same as though he gave himself; he did give himself. And since the Just died for the unjust (1 *Peter* 3:18), God can be just and count as righteous the one who will have faith in Jesus.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.1*

"Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith." The term "law" as used in this verse has no reference to a code, or to any set rules laid down. It must be considered rather as having the sense of "principle." We are justified, not on the principle of works, but on the principle of faith. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." No other conclusion can be arrived at from what has gone before. By the deeds of the law there can no flesh be justified, for all have sinned, and those who obtain righteousness

obtain it freely as a gift, through the graciousness of God. This excludes boasting. No one can boast of what he has done, for he has done nothing of which a good man would boast. Only good deeds are worthy to be boasted of; but the goodness that we have is given us by the Lord, and so we cannot boast of that. As Paul says elsewhere: "For who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it? 2 *Corinthians* 4:7. There is no chance for boasting except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.2*

There are a few expressions in the portion already passed over that must have more attention. One is, "To declare his righteousness for the remission of sin that are past." This must not be taken as indicating that the grace of God exhausts itself in pardoning sin, and that for our future life we must stand alone. No; if that were true, boasting would not be excluded. We are as dependent on Christ for the continued manifestation of his righteousness in us as for the first exhibition of it. He says: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me, ...for without me ye can do nothing." *John* 15:4, 5. But God's grace does not remit any sins except those that are past. Sins that are not past have no existence. To remit or pardon them before they are committed would simply be to grant indulgence or license to sin; only the Pope has presumed to do that, and in so doing he has set himself above God. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.3*

Note also that the righteousness by faith of Jesus Christ is "unto all and upon all them that believe." On the word rendered "unto," Prof. James R. Boise has this excellent note: "Not simply *unto*, in the sense to, towards, up to, as the word is commonly understood; but *into* (in the strict and usual sense of *eis*), entering into the heart, into the inner being of *all those who have faith*." This is exactly in accordance with God's promise in the covenant: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." *Jeremiah* 31:33. The righteousness that comes by faith is not superficial; it is actual; it is made a part of the individual. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.4*

And let no one lose sight of the grand fact that not for a moment



can anybody escape from the law. The law is ever present. The gospel does not absolve from obligation to it; on the contrary, the gospel emphasizes our obligation, in that it exists for the sole purpose of bringing us into a state of perfect obedience to the law. The man who imagines that faith leads away from the law, does not know what faith is, nor what it is for. Faith can be exercised only toward Christ, who is its author and finisher. He alone has been set forth as the object of faith. But he has been set forth only "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." *2 Corinthians 5:21*. Says Paul again: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." *Ephesians 2:10*. The antinomian is not the man who has genuine faith in Christ. He cannot be, for if he has Christ, he must have the law; for Christ is the embodiment of the law. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.5*

And now for a very brief summary of the verses that we have commented upon. First, all are guilty, condemned by the law, so that they cannot get from it the righteousness which it requires. They try again and again, but in vain; they cannot turn aside its just condemnation. But now Christ appears on the scene. He is the one whence the law derives all its righteousness, and he promises to give it freely to all who will *accept* it. This he can do, because grace, as well as truth, comes by him. The sinner accepts Christ, tremblingly, yet knowing that it is his only hope. Christ covers him with the robe of righteousness (*Isaiah 61:10*) and puts his righteousness into his heart. He takes away the filthy garment, and clothes him with change of raiment, saying, "Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee." *Zechariah 3:3-5*. And now the law, which before condemned him, witnesses to his righteousness. It engages to go into court and defend anyone upon whom is found that righteousness, for it is its own righteousness. And so the man who was almost in despair because he could not get righteousness of the law, and who turned from it, finds it in its perfection in Christ. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.6*

"Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we

know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.” *1 John 3:1-3*. This hope and purification work reciprocally. The hope that when Christ comes we shall see him as he is, and be like him, must necessarily tend to purity of life. A man cannot possess that hope without becoming purer. And purity of life makes more certain the hope; for the promise is that the pure in heart shall see God. What makes this hope the more real is that the possessor has a partial fulfillment of it even in this life. Only those will see God as he is who have made his acquaintance here. By faith they see him now, as Moses, who “endured as seeing him who is invisible.” Acquaintance and association with God and the angels must be begun in this life if it is to be continued in eternity. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.7*

**“Hope” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.” *1 John 3:1-3*. This hope and purification work reciprocally. The hope that when Christ comes we shall see him as he is, and be like him, must necessarily tend to purity of life. A man cannot possess that hope without becoming purer. And purity of life makes more certain the hope; for the promise is that the pure in heart shall see God. What makes this hope the more real is that the possessor has a partial fulfillment of it even in this life. Only those will see God as he is who have made his acquaintance here. By faith they see him now, as Moses, who “endured as seeing him who is invisible.” Acquaintance and association with God and the angels must be begun in this life if it is to be continued in eternity. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.8*

**“A Good Utterance” The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the evening of August 26, a banquet was given in the First Congregational Church, Oakland, Cal., by the Congregational Club, in honor of Rev. Dr. R. R. Meredith, of Brooklyn, N.Y., who was its guest. Many pastors of Congregational Churches in San Francisco and the surrounding towns, were present. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.9*

In response to several addresses, in which warm fraternal sentiments were expressed toward himself, Dr. Meredith said that two thoughts had been uppermost in his mind during his journey across the continent, and his thirty days' visit on the coast. These thoughts were Christianity and the country. Of the former, he said: Strictly defined, its essential spirit is a missionary spirit. From its institution down to this day, its true work has been missionary work. The church, which is the embodiment of Christianity, is necessarily a missionary society; that and nothing else. Jesus Christ, the author of Christianity, and the founder of the church, was himself strictly a missionary; for he came to seek and to save them that were lost. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.10*

As to the country, he firmly believed that God had, for centuries before it was settled, kept his hand upon this land for a peculiar purpose, keeping out the old nations until an appointed time. And this peculiar purpose, he believed, was to establish on this continent a nation in which the political and religious institutions should be kept utterly separate; in short, a nation in which there should be not the shadow of a union of Church and State, and no State support for church schools. And he thanked God for that purpose; for Christianity needs no aid, no support, from the State. Christianity has power within itself to stand alone; to accomplish its own mission; and should the day ever come in this country, when the church, as in an hour of great temptation in the third century join hands with the State to accomplish her aims, that will be her day of peril, and will seal the fate of the country. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.11*

So far as Dr. Meredith's utterance is concerned, it is all right, but the trouble is, he does not realize what may constitute a union of

Church and State. The fact that he says, "Should the day ever come in this country when the Church...joins hands with the State to accomplish her aims," etc., shows that he does not realize that the church is quite generally doing that very thing now, in asking the State to teach religion in the public schools, and to maintain Sunday observance. And so, in spite of his opposition to Church and State union, he may be expected to lend a hand to help it on. Yet we are glad of such utterances, for they call people's attention to the danger attending a union of Church and State, and so prepare them to oppose it when we show them that the principle of such union is embodied in Sunday legislation.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 474.12*

**"An Unanswerable Argument" The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is positively the very latest thing in the line of arguments against the Sabbath of the Lord. It is from an article in the *World's Crisis* of August 20. We are thus particular in giving the credit, lest it should be doubted that anybody is capable of evolving such an argument:-*SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.1*

"Why do people want to keep the seventh day? No one will ever get any credit from God for so doing. Let me hear call your attention to a point that I have never read in print, and maybe somewhat new. When Paul was telling Timothy what should transpire in the last days, making them perilous, he mentions a score or more features, but says nothing about Sabbath-breaking. To my mind this is an unanswerable argument against the seventh day been binding."*SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.2*

We think that this is not only "somewhat new," but altogether new. We freely allow to the writer all honors of its discovery. Paul didn't mention Sabbath-breaking in his list of last-day horrors, therefore the seventh day cannot be binding! Very well, let us go on. Paul said not a word in that list about stealing, therefore the eighth commandment cannot be binding, and must be right to steal. He didn't mention drunkenness, therefore the temperance societies are all anti-scriptural. He said nothing about the worship of graven

images, therefore, to the mind of the discoverer of the new anti-Sabbath argument, this is doubtless an unanswerable argument against there being anything wrong in idol-worship. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.3*

We confess that we are disgusted with such folly. We were going to call it childish reasoning, but we have too high an opinion of children's logic. No child would argue in such a way. We have this apology to make for taking the space to notice it: We know that it is not worth answering, but it is an excellent specimen of the extremities to which men are driven in their fight against the Sabbath. The fact that men with presumably fair sense can call such an assemblage of words an unanswerable argument against the seventh day being binding, is a strong argument in its favor. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.4*

As to the idea of keeping the Sabbath in order to get credit, we have only to say that we don't expect any. After we have done all, we shall be obliged to confess that we are "unprofitable servants;" we shall have done only our duty. Eternal life will come as a gift. But if we get no credit for doing what we are plainly commanded to do, what will be the case if we fall short of that? Here is something that our friend will do well to consider. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.5*

**"Millennial Conversion" The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Evangelist* (Presbyterian) says:-*SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.6*

"Is it a pleasing fact to look in the face, that our church through the past seven years has added to its ranks from the world not quite *four* each year for every hundred of its members? At this rate, it will need centuries to complete its conquests, for its numbers would be doubled only after eighteen and a half years." *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.7*

It certainly is not a pleasing fact, from whatever standpoint it is

looked at. And it would seem to be quite a discouraging factor for those to look at who think that the world is to be converted before the coming of the Lord. The number of heathen born every year is greater than the number of converts to Christianity in the whole world. Will the result be to open men's eyes to the truth that the coming of the Lord to judgment will alone put an end to wickedness?-No; finding that the millennium will not come through preaching, but, on the contrary, wickedness increases, they will foolishly think to make people Christian by legal enactment. When they induce all nations to pass "Christian laws," then, in the midst of still existing wickedness, they will cry, "Peace and safety," when sudden destruction will come. *1 Thessalonians 5:2, 3*. The doctrine of the temporal millennium will be responsible for the lack of preparation on the part of thousands. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.8*

**"Protestantism and Persecution" The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

In his speech before the National Convention of Teachers, at St. Paul, Archbishop Ireland said:-*SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.9*

"I would permeate the regular State school with the religion of the majority of the children of the land, be it as Protestant as Protestantism can be, and I would, as they do in England, pay for the secular instruction given in denominational schools according to results." *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.10*

We have argued many times that such a course would be a complete union of Church and State, although it is just what thousands of professed "reformers" in United States are clamoring for. But the views which we have often stated are put so well by the *Independent* that we gladly give place to them. Speaking of the archbishop's plan, it says:-*SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.11*

"We Protestants cannot accept it. We do not want the State to make our public schools 'as Protestant as Protestantism can be.' We do not trust the State enough for that. We do not want the State to interfere with our religious matters. We cannot depend on the State

to provide the sort of teachers always to whose religious instruction we are willing to commit our children. We know too well what that means. If the State can see to it that in its schools the children are taught its own Protestant religion, then it can say that this is a Protestant country, and that we do not want any but Protestants to come here; that other religions are foreign and un-American, unpatriotic and seditious; that Catholic parochial schools are a menace to our Protestant institutions, and if Catholic schools, then Catholic Churches; and the step is not a long one, and is a most logical one, to persecution. A State Church means persecution. There is always a quarrel until you have either an absolute, persecuting State Church, or an absolutely free church. The Protestant State Churches of Europe are rapidly becoming free churches. So far as they are not free, the religion of the minority is practiced under a disadvantage. Catholics and Dissenters even in England now suffer under serious disadvantages, which are not persecution simply because England is moving perceptibly toward complete establishment." *SITI September 8, 1890, page 475.12*

Perhaps such words as these, coming from so influential a journal as the *New York Independent*, will be given some attention. If any advocate of State religion is able to show that the position is not a just one, we should be glad to know it. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.1*

**"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is expected that the missionary ship, *Pitcairn*, will be dedicated on Thursday, September 25, during the camp-meeting at Oakland. *SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.2*

Isn't it strange that the laboring men, who are represented by the Sunday-law lecturers as consumed with desire for a Sunday law, are in mortal dread of saying anything about it, lest they should lose their places, and yet they will strike for an advance of twenty-five cents a day in wages, or even when they have no personal grievance, if a fellow-workman is discharged? *SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.3*

Through the courtesy of Hon. George Hearst we have received two interesting volumes of Reports from the Department of Agriculture for 1888 and 1889. From a hasty examination of the volumes, we are convinced that our National Department of Agriculture is doing better and more thorough work than in times past. Thanks, Senator, for these and all other documents.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.4*

The Maryland State Prohibition Platform has the following as one of its planks:-*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.5*

"We approve our Sabbath laws and their enforcement, which secures to the people one day's rest in seven."*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.6*

This, the *New York Voice* calls an almost model platform. But that political platform which approves of Maryland Sabbath laws is as far from model as the darkest laws of the Dark Ages is from the Constitution of the United States.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.7*

Dr. W. W. Atterbury, of New York, is quoted by the *Alta California* of August 18 as saying in a recent sermon, on this coast: "The great principle of our Sunday law is not coercion, but protection." Dr. Atterbury may believe this, but there is no statement farther from the truth. Every believer in Sunday sacredness in this broad land, can observe the day as religiously as he desires, without a Sunday law. Seventh-day people have no difficulty in observing the Sabbath, with the busy world against them. Cannot Sunday-keepers do equally well with so many on their side? Those who do not believe in Sunday are not asking for protection, unless it be some who do it on the principle of reducing time and maintaining or increasing wages. Sunday laws are asked for by those who believe in the day, in order to *coerce*, or *compel*, those who do *not* believe in it to keep it as though they did. The principle underlying Sunday laws is *coercion*, and *only coercion*.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.8*

The only true union among Christians is union with Christ. Men may try to patch up union between themselves, but it lasts only so long as will subserve their selfish purposes. Man cannot be grafted upon



man for the reason that no man has life in himself to impart to others. Such a union is like the union of two separate branches; there is no vitality to it. But if the Christian is united as a branch to the Living Vine, Christ Jesus, the One who has life in himself, that branch becomes transfused with the life of the Vine, a part of the very stock itself. Two Christians thus united are united to each other by a bond which no power on earth can break. That bond is the Lord Jesus Christ. In this way is our Lord's prayer answered: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." *John 17:21*. This is the union which God desires; this is the only true union possible!*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.9*

The additions to the Northern Presbyterian Church last year amounted to about 49,000. This was an increase of one member to every fifteen church-members. The New York *Observer* finds in these figures no cause for congratulations, as the net gain in the church is less than three per cent. There were six thousand accessions less than in 1889. It says truly that these things ought to bestir the people and pastors. If our Presbyterian brethren (and the lesson is as good for all) had placed as much thought on the word of God and its teaching as upon the revision of the Westminster Confession, it would doubtless have gained spiritually as well as numerically.*SITI September 8, 1890, page 476.10*

## September 15, 1890

“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

In an article in the *Independent*, concerning the railroads and the labor troubles, the Hon. Cassius M. Clay says:-*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.11*

“There is anarchy and civil war lowering along the whole horizon. There comes anarchy, and then, like as in the French Revolution in 1787, despotism.”*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.12*

The Universal Congress of Catholics is to be held at Liege, Belgium, this month. Delegates are expected to be present from every Catholic country in the world. Among the subjects to be discussed are: The Temporal Power of the Pope, and Papal Arbitration. The Congress is said to be the outcome of a circular letter which was sent to all Catholic bishops two years ago, asking if they thought it advisable for the Pope to leave Rome.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.13*

Here is an example of the illogical manner in which men too often handle Bible doctrines:-*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.14*

“On the morning of his resurrection, Jesus said, ‘I have not yet ascended to my Father.’ We have his word, therefore, that he did not enter Paradise on the day of his death.”-Rev. C. C. Foote, *Detroit*.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.15*

“We must remember Christ ubiquity. As he could enter that ‘upper room’ to the disciples without opening the door, so he was in paradise without ‘ascending’ there.”-*Christian Cynosure*.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.16*

Which is the plainest kind of a *non sequitur*. Jesus didn’t enter that upper room without going to it. He was actually in the room; but he plainly declared to Mary that he had not ascended to the Father. “Ubiquity” doesn’t cause one to be in a place to which he hasn’t gone.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.17*

The New York *Observer*, in an editorial on “Filling the Treasury,” takes a position against grab-bag, fairs, festivals, and other ungodly means of raising money for the church, and says:—*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.18*

“Such means more money-raising for the purposes of God’s kingdom can scarcely be too strongly and sially denounced. It is a question whether the church will ever be the successful opponent of evils in the world that she could be, if she leans for her financial support upon worldly men or worldly measures. What concord has Christ with Belial? Did all the faithful, godly pastors of our land speak their minds on this subject they would present an awful array of testimony concerning the ill effects of worldly-wise methods for filling church coffers.”*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.19*

But what are faithful and godly pastors for if it is not to speak their minds on such subjects as this? And if pastors do not speak their minds when such a canker is eating the heart out of the church, can they be called faithful and godly? The command is, “Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.” *Isaiah 58:1*. And there is no question at all whether the church can ever be the successful opponent of evils in the world, when she cherishes the evils of the world in her own bosom.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.20*

**“Is the Seventh-day Sabbath Binding Upon Christians?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above heading the *Leader* of August 14 contained twelve propositions answering the question in the negative. We have heard the article spoken of several times as being something that Sabbatarians couldn’t answer; and as the *Leader* is the principal organ of the Baptist denomination on the Pacific Coast, it has doubtless had much influence with those who are not conversant with the Sabbath question. For this reason we take space to show the weakness of the answers. In the various paragraphs below will be found the entire article:—*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.21*

“Recently I was asked to answer this question publicly, My reply was No! and for the following reasons:-*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.22*

“*First-For 2,000 years, no command was given for anyone to keep the Sabbath.SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.23*

The same thing may be said of the prohibition against idol-worship and blasphemy. Shall we therefore conclude that Christians are at liberty to do those things? If not, how does silence about the Sabbath indicate that we are not to keep it? For a period of six hundred years after the law was given upon Mount Sinai nothing was said, so far as we have any record, about the Sabbath. Shall we conclude that God did not care to have even the Jews keep it-No; we are glad to know that the God whom we worship does not have to repeat his commandments every year or every century, in order to have them valid. But, as a matter of fact, we have the most explicit reference to the seventh-day Sabbath twenty-five hundred years before the exodus. After creation was completed, God rested on the seventh day, and the record says: “And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” *Genesis 2:3*. To sanctify means to set apart, to appoint, to command. See *Joshua 20:7*, margin; *Joel 2:15*. Therefore the inspired record is that as soon as the first week of time was ended, God commanded the observance of the seventh day. Even if it were true that twenty-five hundred years passed before the command was given to keep the Sabbath, that would determine nothing as to our duty now. Men do not argue so in regard to human laws. The fact that a law was enacted only last year is not considered as a reason why it should not be obeyed.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.24*

“*Second-When the command was first given, it was given to the Israelites. Exodus 16:23.SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.25*

“*Third-It seems plain from Exodus 16:27-30, that they did not keep the Sabbath previous to this time.”SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.26*

This is not true, as has been shown in the preceding paragraph. The command to observe the seventh day as the Sabbath was

given in Eden at the close of the creation. It was given to Adam, the father, not of the Jews, but of the whole human family, thus indicating that it is for the race, in harmony with the declaration of Jesus, "The Sabbath was made for man." *Mark 2:27*. The only day that was known as the Sabbath when Jesus said this, and the day which was the special subject of remark on that occasion, was the seventh day of the week. The reading of *Exodus 16:23* is sufficient to prove that it is not the first command to keep the Sabbath, nor indeed is it a command at all. It is simply a reference to a commandment already given. The entire transaction recorded in the sixteenth of Exodus shows that the Sabbath was well known. As to the statement in "reason" *third*, that "it seems plain from *Exodus 16:27-30* that they did not keep the Sabbath previous to this time," we have only to say, Read it, and see for yourselves. Some of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and the Lord said, "*How long* refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" *Exodus 16:28*. This is sufficient proof that the Sabbath was not a new thing. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.27*

"*Fourth*-This is further corroborated by the fact that on the three preceding seventh days, the whole camp to Israel was on the march." *SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.28*

It is of no use to take time on this, for it is an assertion unbacked by any proof, and which is incapable of proof. It is a lamentable fact that many opposers of the Sabbath of the Lord do not hesitate to resort to fiction, in the absence of argument. This should open the eyes of the candid. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 476.29*

"*Fifth*-The Sabbath, and the laws pertaining thereto, was given to the Israelites alone, and was to be a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, and a sign of the covenant between them and the Lord. *Exodus 31:13-17; Deuteronomy 5:12, 15.*" *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.1*

This is true of all the commandments to the same extent that it is true of the fourth. Paul says that the chief advantage of the Jews lay in the fact that to them were committed the oracles of God. *Romans 3:1, 2*. It was committed to them to make known to others. They were to be the light of the world, as Jesus himself declared to a

congregation of Jews. *Matthew 5:14*. The Sabbath was given them as a sign, that they might know God; but God never designed to shut himself up to the Jewish nation. He wants all men to know him; he is known by his works; and the Sabbath is the memorial of creation. This also is additional proof that the Sabbath was made for all men. Moreover, God has no covenant except with Israel (see *Hebrews 8:8-10; Romans 9:3, 4; Ephesians 2:11, 12*), and only the seed of Abraham are Christ's and heirs of the kingdom (*Galatians 3:29*). If any Gentiles are saved, they must be grafted into the stock of Israel. See *Romans 11:13-26*. So the fact that a thing was given to Israel is nothing against it, but rather in its favor; "for salvation is of the Jews." *John 4:22*. And the fact that Israel is to be the nation that will endure throughout eternity and that the Sabbath was given them to be observed throughout their generations, shows that it is binding on Christians both now and forever. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.2*

"*Sixth*-If the law of the Seventh-day Sabbath is binding upon all, then the penalties are also binding. No work was to be done, no fire was to be kindled by anyone, under penalty of death. *Exodus 31:14, 15; 35:2, 3; Numbers 15:32-36; Ezekiel 20:10; Deuteronomy 5:14*." *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.3*

Very true, the penalty is as sure as the law. The penalty for Sabbath-breaking was death, and is still the same. The same is true of any of the commandments. The penalty for idolatry, blasphemy, and persistent disobedience to parents, was death, and is still; for "the wages of sin is death." But God has not committed to men in this age the execution of the penalty. The Jewish government was a theocracy; God himself was their ruler. It is not so now, for his people, the true Israel, are in all nations; but when they are gathered out at the coming of the Lord, then it will be seen that the penalty for violation of God's law is death; and unto his people will it be given to share with him in executing the judgment which is written. See. *Psalms 119:9*. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.4*

"*Seventh*-Nowhere in the Old nor New Testaments are the Gentiles commanded to keep the Seventh-day Sabbath, but Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, are in *Colossians 2:13-17* forbidden to insist on keeping the Jewish Sabbath-days." *SITI September 15, 1890, page*

The first part of this has been answered in number 5, above. The latter part is sufficiently answered by saying that the seventh day is not, and never was, a Jewish Sabbath. The Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." *Exodus 20:10*. He also styles it, "my holy day." *Isaiah 58:13*. This day the true Israel-Christians-are commanded to keep throughout their generations, and they will do so as long as the new heavens and the new earth endure. *Isaiah 66:22, 23*. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.6*

"*Eighth*-Christ, in his teaching, calls attention to, and enforces, all of the commandments, except the fourth. Why this exception, if that was still in force?" This is simply not true. Nowhere in the teaching of Christ is there the slightest reference to the second commandment. This does not prove that the second commandment is not binding on Christians, and that they are free to worship idols. As we said before, we worship a God who does not have to repeat his commandments often, in order to give them force. When he speaks once, that is sufficient. Is not this a more loyal way of looking at the matter? Christ has nowhere in his teachings repealed the fourth commandment, therefore it must still be binding. But the fact is the Lord made no exception in the commandments, but declared them all to be binding. Said he, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17*. This should stop the mouth of every man who professes to love the Lord. By the way, isn't it strange that Christ's utter silence in regard to the first day of the week is not considered by first-day advocates as anything against the claim that it is a sacred rest day? *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.7*

"*Ninth*-After Christ's resurrection, the disciples met for worship on the first day of the week. *Matthew 25:21; Mark 16:2-9; John 20:1, 19-26; Acts 20:27; 1 Corinthians 16:2; Revelation 1:10*." *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.8*

This proves nothing. They also met on the Sabbath. See *Acts 13:14, 42, 44; 17:21; 18:4*. They also met every day. *Acts 2:46*. It is amazing that men will offer to prove that the seventh-day Sabbath of the fourth commandment is not binding, and then will gravely

say, “The disciples met on the first day of the week,” as though that simple fact was sufficient to overthrow the commandment, or had any relation whatever to it. But let us look a moment at the texts referred to prove that the disciples met for worship on the first day. *Matthew 28:1*; *Mark 16:2*; *John 20:1* all refer to a single first day, the day of the resurrection; and not one of them says anything about any meeting. They simply state the fact of Christ’s resurrection. *Mark 16:9* says not a word about any meeting of the disciples, but simply says that Christ “appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.” Nothing about Sunday worship in that. *John 20:19* does speak of a meeting of Christ and his disciples on that same first day of the week, and *Mark 16:14* informs us that this meeting of the disciples was at their own home, for the purpose of eating supper. *Acts 20:27* makes no reference to any day of the week; but *Acts 20:7-11*, which the writer evidently meant, does speak of a meeting on the dark part of the first day of the week, namely, Saturday night, and of a long journey which Paul and his companions took the next day, Sunday. *1 Corinthians 16:2* makes no reference to any meeting on the first day of the week, but on the contrary, directs each one to “lay by him in store,” as God had prospered him. And, lastly, *Revelation 1:10* says nothing of the first day of the week in anywise, but mentions “the Lord’s day,” which the Lord himself declares to be the seventh day. See *Exodus 20:10*; *Isaiah 58:13*; *Mark 2:28*. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.9*

“*Tenth*-The spirit of the fourth commandment is: Work six days and rest one. This can be done by resting on the first day, and working the other six.” *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.10*

The spirit of the fourth commandment cannot be kept by breaking it. It commands the observance of “the seventh day.” The commandment not only says that we are to work six days and rest one, but it tells us particularly upon which one we are to rest. Who but one whose heart was fully set in him to disobey, could argue that a direct command to rest on “the seventh day” can be complied with by resting on the first day? *SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.11*

“*Eleventh*-In regard to rest, morality, piety, or true religion, the



keeping of the seventh day has not a whit the advantage over the first.”*SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.12*

We submit that God is the best judge of what constitutes “rest, morality, piety, or true religion.” The keeping of the seventh day has just this advantage over the first, that God has commanded it, and he has said nothing about the first except to include it in the six days in which work may be done.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.13*

“*Twelfth*-Ninety-nine per cent of those who keep any Sabbath keep the first day of the week. If God does not require it, why should one percent insist that the other ninety-nine should change their Sabbath?”*SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.14*

Where in the Bible is it stated that truth and duty are to be determined by the practice of ninety-nine per cent, of the people? He says, “Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.” Ninety-nine per cent of the people in the days of Noah thought he was a fool, but the result showed that he was right and that they were wrong. Ninety-nine percent of the Jews, and more, rejected Christ when he was on earth; yet this did not prove that he was not the Messiah. The majority of the people on earth to-day do not worship the one God, Jehovah. The great majority of those who profess to believe in baptism, call sprinkling baptism, and sneer at the Baptists for insisting on immersion; yet this does not prove that the Baptists are wrong in obeying literally. The majority say that the spirit of the commandment is met by pronouncing the formula and applying a little water; the Baptists insist on actual baptism, immersion in water, according to the command. If the practice of the majority is to determine what is right, why do not the Baptists give up immersion? A Baptist should be the last one in the world to argue against obedience to the letter of any precept, or to urge numbers as proof that a practice is right.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.15*

We have denoted this space to the consideration of these “reasons” against Sabbath-keeping, because they are the *reasons* that are kept in stock, and are used all over the country. Wherever the Sabbath truth is taught, these objections are urged. Let the friends of the Sabbath lose no opportunity to enlighten those who have not

examined both sides, by showing to them the utter absence of reason in the “reasons” against the Sabbath. E. J. W.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.16*

**“No California Sunday-law” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

Here is something for our ardent Sunday-law friends to explain. A prominent citizen of Melbourne, Australia, who is visiting in San Francisco, said: “In Australia, Sunday is a holy day, observed by all; in San Francisco it is a gala days; yet I saw fewer people drunk here on Sunday than on the same day in Sydney or Melbourne.” Our Eastern friends are apt to imagine that California is a terribly lawless place because it has no Sunday law; but as a matter of fact, there is not a State in the Union where life and property are more safe than here, and Sunday is as quiet a day in San Francisco as in Chicago, New York, or even Philadelphia, the home of Sunday legislation. Religious legislation is far from being synonymous with moral development.*SITI September 15, 1890, page 482.17*

**“Destroying the Foundations” The Signs of the Times, 16, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is doubtless well known to the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that there is quite a body of people professing to look for the coming of the Lord, who do not keep the seventh day, and who are probably the most bitter of all people in their opposition to the Sabbath of the Lord. The name which they take to themselves is “Advent Christians,” the idea being that Adventists who keep the Sabbath are not Christians. This explanation is made simply that the readers may understand who the people are that made the following remarkable resolution, which we find in the *World’s Crisis* of August 6:-*SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.1*

“WHEREAS, There are many people among the Advent Christians who believe that the decalogue of ten commandments is in full force in the Christian dispensation; and,*SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.2*

“WHEREAS, By the Advent Christian Conference of Oregon and Washington, that the ministers of our denomination, especially our evangelists, have not done their whole duty if they terminate a series of meetings in a new field without teaching that the five books of Moses, including the decalogue, are one law, and as each are abrogated.” *SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.3*

We pass by the fact that this resolution carries by the board all the commandments, and obliges the ministers to teach that the commands not to steal, kill, commit adultery, or bear false witness owed their existence to the prejudices of an unenlightened age, and are obsolete. That they might be able to do; but we should think that they would often get into difficulty in carrying out the resolution. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.4*

For instance: The book of Genesis tells about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It relates the wonderful history of Joseph. In Exodus we are told of Moses and the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Now some on of those preachers will almost involuntarily begin to talk about Abraham and his faith, or the integrity and purity of Joseph, before he remembers that it has been officially declared by his denomination that those records are abrogated, and of no account. A thing is placed upon record because it is supposed to be true, therefore the abrogation of it is evidence that it has been discovered that it is not true. Now let us see how much of the Bible those preachers are permitted to teach. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.5*

They cannot teach that if we are Christ's we are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise, for, according to the resolution, there never was any such man as Abraham. They cannot draw any lessons form the first half of the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, for that is all based upon an abrogated record. They must teach that there was never any such man as Moses, and that the Israelites were never delivered from Egypt. The story of the flood must be classed with fables, and the story of creation likewise. *SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.6*

Possibly they may begin to tell their people that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,” before they remember

that this is founded upon an outgrown tradition. The story of the fall of Adam has been abrogated. Then forgetting that the abrogation of the story of the fall makes unnecessary the story of redemption, they may begin to tell about the glory of our Advocate, who is "made an high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek," when their better-instructed audience would interrupt them with the query, which would now be pertinent, "Who was Melchizedek?" Sure enough; that story about Melchizedek has been abrogated, together with the statement which the Lord made to Moses: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." *Deuteronomy 18:18, 19. SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.7*

And so the evidence of the Lord as "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin" (*Exodus 34:6, 7*) is abrogated. But if it is abrogated there, it must be everywhere, and so the whole gospel of Christ must be overturned in order to get rid of the Sabbath. This is even so, for Christ said, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" *John 5:46, 47*. Belief on Christ depends on belief of Moses; therefore if the five books of Moses be abrogated, Christ himself is taken from us. Well did the psalmist ask, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" *Psalms 11:3. SITI September 15, 1890, page 483.8*

Dear Christian reader, do you think it is worth while to overturn the whole plan of redemption, in order to get rid of the duty to keep the Sabbath? You say it is not necessary to do that in order to show that we need not keep the seventh day. But think a minute. Here are people who have been forty years fighting the seventh-day Sabbath, and is it not to be presumed that in that time they have found the best argument that can be devised? They have tried everything, and find this the most effective. They have found that the only consistent way to oppose the Sabbath is to abolish the entire revelation of God to man, for it all goes with the five books of

Moses. Doesn't it seem to you that a cause that requires such desperate measures must be dangerous? Is not the fact that opposers of the Sabbath can take such a position sufficient evidence that they are wrong in their opposition? Think of this carefully, and decide to "remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy." E. J. W. *SITI* September 15, 1890, page 483.9

## September 22, 1890

“Front Page” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

“The ear that heareth the reproof of life abideth along the wise,” but “he that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul.” *SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.10*

When the fearful storms, tempests, and cyclones have been pointed to as fulfilling prophecy, thereby indicating that we are in the last days, people have been wont to say, “Cyclones are peculiar to America and its prairies, and have always been prevalent through the centuries past.” But will these same wise heads tell us the same of the European cyclones? Two severe ones of late have made havoc in Switzerland and Styria. These electric storms are certainly a latter-day innovation there. The fact is, as the Bible declare, the earth is waxed old as doth a garment. *SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.11*

The Lord said to Israel, “When ye make many prayers, I will not hear,” and the same may be said of the present day. Max O'Rell, the French humorist, says: “The other day I was introduced to an audience with prayer, and in that prayer the Lord was asked to allow my audience to see through my jokes.” Such is not prayer; it is flat blasphemy. Well does the *Lutheran Witness* says: “Such flippant abuse of prayer-so many sectarian reverends being ready to open any sort of meeting with prayer, and another ‘brother’ closing it with the benediction-and oh, what flippant praying!-is only too common.” *SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.12*

It is cheering whenever we find a voice raised against the tendency which so many churches manifest, to attempt to do gospel work according to worldly methods. The *New York Witness* having been appealed to to decide as to the propriety of using a church edifice for popular amusements and games, and thus perhaps get them into the habit of attending religious services, decides that it is proper. From this decision the *Christian Advocate* strongly dissents, and says, among other things: *SITI September 22, 1890, page*

“The hope of the young men that a gymnasium in the church will attract other young men to the place of worship is vain. The belief which they express, that the church cannot reach the masses without these accessories, is not sustained by past experience. These things have been tried and have failed. There is nothing so attractive to young men as young men. There is no instrument with which the church can work so effectively as the gospel. Amusements have no place in the church.”*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.14*

If we are in doubt as regards the right or wrong of a certain course, it is always safe not to pursue it. Give right and God the benefit of every doubt. To do this may seem at the time to be loss in some way, but it only *seems* so. The better way is always the right. Fools look only to the present. The butterfly lives only for the present; but the child of God ought to measure circumstances and decisions by their eternal results, not by their present appearance.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.15*

**“Not a Debt, But a Gift. *Romans 4:1-8*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

If we are in doubt as regards the right or wrong of a certain course, it is always safe not to pursue it. Give right and God the benefit of every doubt. To do this may seem at the time to be loss in some way, but it only *seems* so. The better way is always the right. Fools look only to the present. The butterfly lives only for the present; but the child of God ought to measure circumstances and decisions by their eternal results, not by their present appearance.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.16*

Let us take a very brief review of the first three chapters of Romans, that we may the better understand the force of the fourth, as we begin it. The first chapter, after the introduction, treats of the terrible depravity and blindness of the heathen, and how they lost the knowledge of God which they once had. It closes with the statement that they themselves know that for their deeds they deserve this

condemnation to death, which God has pronounced upon them.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.17*

In the second chapter we have all men brought into the same condemnation with the heathen. There is no room in the writings of Paul for any of the modern speculation about future probation for the heathen. They are all shown to be justly condemned to death. To this sentence the Jews would give a cordial assent; but now he declares that all who know enough to judge the heathen, thereby condemn themselves, for they show that they know better, yet they do the same things.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.18*

Passing on through the second chapter, we find the truth stated that to every man God will render according to his deeds, whether good or evil, because he is no respecter of persons. Thus we learn that it is *doing*, and nothing less, that finds favor with God, and that the Gentiles, who are without the written law, really have the law, and will be judged by it at the last day. Next, the matter is brought home directly to the Jews, and they are shown to be guilty of transgressing the law, while making their boast in it; and thus he shows that in reality they are not Jews at all, for only those are Jews who keep the law. The man who has not received the outward sign of circumcision, but who keeps the righteousness of the law, is an Israelite indeed; while the man who has been circumcised, and who may be able to trace his genealogy to Abraham, is not a Jew at all, if he does not keep the law.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.19*

In the first nineteen verses of the third chapter the fact is emphasized that both Jews and Gentiles are in the same condemnation; all are within the sphere of the law; it speaks to all; and as a consequence, all are declared guilty before God. The conclusion from all this is that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified in the sight of God. The law is the perfect pattern of truth, therefore it must declare all men guilty and not righteous; and no one can hope to atone for his guilt by deeds of righteousness, because his best efforts come far short of the required standard, and so really add to the measure of his guilt.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.20*



In this extremity the righteousness of God without the law, in the person of Jesus Christ, is manifested. This righteousness is just that which the law demands, and it is put upon all who believe in Christ. Without money and without price, this righteousness is freely given to all who exercise faith in his blood. This righteousness put upon the sinner, takes the place of his sins, which are removed as far as the east is from the west, and he who before was a sinner now stands justified before God, his righteousness attested to by the law, although he has not done the law. He has been justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. This removes all ground for boasting, for no man has anything by his own merits. There is one God, both of Jews and Gentiles, and he justifies both Jew and Gentile in the same way, namely, by faith, for his own sake, through the merits of Christ. Thus it is by faith, and not by works, that the law is established in the hearts and lives of men. *SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.21*

And now the Jewish objector returns to the attack with a question very similar to that with which the fourth chapter opens: "What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?" *Romans 4:1*. He has nothing to say to the charge that the Jews as a class are guilty, and cannot be saved without the aid of a power outside of and greater than themselves; but certainly Abraham, the good old father of the nation, must have gained something by his good works. Well, says the apostle, if Abraham was justified by works, he has something whereof to glory. He can boast that his own hand has wrought righteousness and salvation. But we read, "but not before God." That is equivalent to saying, "But Abraham was not justified by works, and has nothing whereof to glory before God;" and the proof is given in verse three: "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." *SITI September 22, 1890, page 483.22*

The scripture to which the apostle refers is *Genesis 15:6*. God took Abraham out and told him to look at the stars and see if he could number them, and said that his seed should be as numerous. And the record is, "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." Paul quotes this in the passive form, but without changing the sense. This scripture proves conclusively that Abraham was not justified by works, and therefore has nothing to

boast of, as to the flesh, any more than any other man. His righteousness was not something of his own working out, but was freely given him by the Lord, because he simply believed what the Lord said.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.1*

“Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.” *Romans 4:4*. Righteousness is the thing under consideration, and so the expression, “to him that worketh,” means, to him that works to secure righteousness. It is very evident that if a man works out his own righteousness, the reward which he gets is not a gift, but the payment of a debt. If he does it all himself, he puts God under obligation to him, to give him the reward of righteousness. He can then come to the Lord and demand his dues. But no man can put God under any obligation to him. The apostle writes: “Who hath first given to him again?” *Romans 11:35*. The Lord himself said to Job: “Who hath prevented me, that I should repay him? Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine.” *Job 41:11*. Whatever the Lord does for man, he does for his own sake. See *Psalms 23:3; Isaiah 43:25*. Therefore the statement in *Romans 3:24-27* stands unshaken. Even Abraham is no exception to the truth that righteousness-conformity to the law-comes alone through faith in Christ.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.2*

“But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.” *Romans 4:5*. “There,” says the antinomian, “I knew there was nothing at all required of us.” Not quite so fast. Remember that we have already learned from the same epistle that God “will render to every man according to his deeds.” *Romans 2:6*. When the Lord Jesus comes, bringing his reward with him, it will be “to give every man according as his work shall be.” *Revelation 22:12*. Works can by no means be left out of the account.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.3*

But works are of no account in securing righteousness for the remission of sins, and that is what is under consideration in this chapter, as we learn very clearly from the next three verses:-*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.4*

“Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed

are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.”*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.5*

Here we learn that when the apostle speaks of one that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, having his faith counted to him for righteousness, he means the forgiveness of sins, which is accomplished, not through any good works of the sinner, but by the imparting of Christ’s righteousness to take the place of the sin. The simple process of bestowing righteousness for the remission of sins is set forth in *Zechariah 3:1-5; Isaiah 61:10; Romans 3:22-25; Titus 3:3-7*. E. J. W.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.6*

**“Is It Personal Rights or Selfishness?” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Young Men’s Era*, of Chicago, in an article relative to the opening of the World’s Fair on Sunday, says:-*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.7*

“Much of the outcry against the enforcement of laws pertaining to Sabbath observance, the Bible in the public schools, etc., is based on the claim of interference with personal rights and religious convictions. Is it not about time the rights and religious convictions of the other side shall be taken into consideration? Shall there not be some assertion that the rights of the Christian people in this country, rights and privileges which we have inherited from our forefathers, and that are vouchsafed to us by the laws of the land, shall be respected?”*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.8*

This is another instance of the prevailing ignorance of what constitutes personal rights. The idea seems to obtain quite generally that the rights of different people almost always clash, and that for one class of people to have their rights, another class must yield theirs. This is a great mistake. Human rights are equal. If no man grasps more than he has a right to, every man will have all that he has a right to. Take the case of Sunday rest. It is stated that every man has a right to it. That is true, if he wants it; and it is just

as true that every man has a right not to rest if he doesn't want to. The right of choice implies the right of refusal. If a man has not the right to refuse to do a certain thing, then he has no right to choose to do it; it is then no longer a matter of right, but of compulsion, and in that case the rights of some are certain to be trampled upon.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.9*

Moreover, the right of one man to refuse to do a certain thing does not interfere with the right of another to do it. The fact that one man doesn't observe Sunday doesn't interfere in the least with the right of another man to keep it. The fact that one man objects to hearing the Bible read, or to having his children hear it read, does not in the least interfere with the right of another man to read it for himself, and to his children. So the opening of the fair on Sunday will not in the least degree interfere with the personal rights and religious convictions of those who regard Sunday as the Sabbath, since none will be compelled to visit it on that day. On the other hand, to refuse to have it opened on that day would seriously interfere with the right of thousands who have no conscientious scruples in regard to the day, and who cannot see the exhibition on any other day, yet who have as much right to see it as others have; and while these are being deprived of a right, those who regard Sunday religiously will not be having anything added to their rights and privileges, since the closing of the fair will not enable them to rest or go to church any better than if it were open.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.10*

In these days professed Christians have need to beware lest they confuse personal rights and selfishness, and while they deprive others of what is their right, add nothing to themselves.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.11*

**“Reading the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is related of Thomas Carlyle that a gentleman at whose house he was stopping asked him to read for morning worship, when he began at the first chapter of Job and continued reading until he had completed the book, saying as he finished, “That is a wonderful

poem, and to be understood needs to be read through at one sitting.” The host, as might naturally be expected, never again asked Carlyle to read the Scriptures at morning worship.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.12*

But Carlyle had the correct idea of Scripture reading—the idea that should be applied not only to the book of Job but to many other books of the Bible, although we would by no means recommend such lengthy reading at family prayers. There, a few verses are often better than even an entire chapter. But it is a great mistake, especially in reading the minor prophets and the epistles, to take them in fragments. One who, in his rigid adherence to the rule of just so many chapters a day, reads the first chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, for instance, as the last of his chapters for one day, the second, third, and fourth the next day, and the fifth and sixth the third day, loses more of the force and beauty of the epistle than can be expressed.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.13*

We do not say that one should never read in one of the epistles without reading all, but we do say that everybody ought to make it a frequent practice to read an entire book at one sitting. Never mind if it does break into your course; better break that than lose the benefit of the connection. It won’t hurt to read a little more. It is not a great thing to do. People will sit down and read in a newspaper more matter than is contained in any one of the epistles, and not think they have performed a great feat.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.14*

Read the Bible through by course as much as you please, but do not neglect reading by books, and studying by books, and you will find that you are beginning to know the Bible as never before.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.15*

**“Righteousness Is Life” The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

“The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord,” Paul declares in *Romans 6:23*. But God does not give this irrespective of character. In fact, he can give eternal life only in one way, and that

is the way of righteousness. He gives life by giving righteousness. They that "receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." *Romans 5:17*. Man is a sinner. Being a sinner, he is subject to death, is condemned to death. If he had never sinned, he never would have died, for death is only the result, or wages, of sin. *James 1:15*. Therefore when man becomes clothed, through faith in Christ, with the perfect righteousness of God, life comes with it as a consequence. "In the way of righteousness is life." *Proverbs 12:28*. Christ could not be holden of death because he was righteous (*Acts 2:24*), and therefore those upon whom he has placed that righteousness are in possession of that life. Death cannot hold them. The gift of righteousness through grace is also the gift of life. *SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.16*

**"Progress of Arbitration" The Signs of the Times, 16, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

The London *Daily News*, commenting on the "Universal Peace Congress" that was recently held in London, says:-*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.17*

"The agreement [for arbitration] between the States of the two Americas marks a stage in the history of civilization, from which there will be no retrogression. The inhabitants of barrak-ridden Europe may well derive some inspiration from the lesson of the New World. Arbitration has won the day among the States of the two Americas, because sixty millions of people in the great republic have been educated up to the idea." *SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.18*

This is news to us on this side of the water. The bloody revolutions now going on in the Central American States do not have much of the flavor of peace; and the men-of-war and the big guns which the United States is building do not look as though this country intended to put its trust in soft words. Never before in the history of the United States, except in time of actual war, has there been so much activity in the way of preparing ships and implements of war. The idea of arbitration has taken hold of but a very few of the sixty-four

million people of this country, and with them it is only a dream that shows no signs of materializing. But the *News* continues:-*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.19*

“The substitution of arbitration for the stupid crime (as it ordinarily is) of war will take place in Europe with the idea of it takes hold of the European mind.”*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.20*

A very just and wise remark,-one which shows more wisdom than is generally exhibited in connection with peace congresses, where the idea seems to obtain that good resolutions will bring about the result. Nations are composed of individuals, and before peace can reign when great provocation is given, the hearts of the people must be changed, and that is a work that is not done in mass. When men are “shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace,” they will be peace-makers; but the word of God gives no warrant for hoping that any such universal change will be wrought. On the contrary, it says that in the last days perilous times will come, because men will be lovers of their own selves, without natural affection, truce-breakers, fierce, despisers of those that are good, and traitors. See *2 Timothy 3:1-4*. Surely there is no hope for arbitration among people of that description.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.21*

There will come a time, however, when peace will reign over all the earth, and there will be no need of arbitration, because there will be nothing to arbitrate. And that time is not far distant. But it will be brought about by such a war as the earth has never yet seen, even the battle of the great day of the Lord (see *Revelation 16:14; 19:11-21; Jeremiah 25:31-33*); and when evil-doers shall have been cut off, and sin and sinners destroyed from the face of the earth, then “the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” *Psalms 37:11*.*SITI September 22, 1890, page 490.22*

## September 29, 1890

“The Blessing of Abraham” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we considered a particular case of justification-that of Abraham-illustrative of the general truth set forth in the third chapter of Romans. In *verses 1-8* we found that Abraham was not made righteous by works, but by faith. Righteousness was a gift by the grace of God to Abraham, the same as to all others, so that even he had nothing whereof to boast. We found also what the imputation of righteousness is, namely, the forgiveness of sins. The righteousness which is counted to a man in response to his faith-the righteousness which is put into and upon all them that believe-is the remission of sins. See *Romans 4:5-8*. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 490.23*

It ought to be apparent from what we have already learned in the book of Romans, that forgiveness of sins is not a mere book transaction,-the simple entry of the word “pardoned” on the books of record,-but that it is an actual fact; something that personally affects the individual. It is righteousness put *into* and *upon* the man; it is *blessedness* that comes to him. It is a change. It does not consist simply in the Lord’s saying to the sinner, “I will not hold the past against you,” but it consists in taking his sin away from him,-removing it as far as the east is from the west,-so that he now stands in the sight of God as though he had never sinned. This is blessedness indeed. Surely, this is more than a change in theory. It is taking a man who is morally bankrupt, and setting him on his feet, so that he can now do good works; for it is only the good man that can do good works. See *Luke 6:45*. And that the righteousness which is imputed for the remission of sin does effect a change in the man is evident from *Romans 3:22*. It is righteousness put *into* and *upon* the sinner. That is, he is made righteous both inside and outside. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 490.24*

The question that the apostle now asks is if this blessed gift comes upon the circumcision only or upon the uncircumcision also; that is, if it is only to Jews or to Gentiles as well. *Romans 4:9*. This is



answered by finding out Abraham's condition when it came to him. "How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." *Romans 4:10, 11. SITI September 29, 1890, page 490.25*

It will be seen at a glance that this settles the matter as to who are children of Abraham. A man cannot claim to be a child of Abraham simply because he has been circumcised. And this means not now only, but at any time in the past. Righteousness was imputed to Abraham before he was circumcised. Therefore since he is the father of all them that believe, it follows that it makes no difference whether they are circumcised or not. Circumcision was only a sign of the righteousness which he already had by faith. Therefore those who had not righteousness had no right to the sign; and if they had the sign and were not righteous, they were children of Abraham only in appearance, and not in fact. See John the Baptist's burning words to the Pharisees. *Matthew 3:7-9. SITI September 29, 1890, page 490.26*

Moreover, it is evident that the sign of circumcision was not given to Abraham and his seed for the purpose of keeping them separate from other nations. God never builds up a wall of partition to keep his people from those who do not believe. Christ said, "Ye are the light of the world," and reproveth the Jews for hiding the light which God had intrusted to them. This they did by clannishly separating themselves from others, considering themselves too good to associate with them. Christ himself set the example, mingling freely with all classes, and bringing from the self-righteous Pharisees the intended reproach, "This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." *Luke 15:2*. He prayed for his disciples, not that they should be taken out of the world, but that they should be kept from the evil. *John 17:15*. The man who is righteous, and who maintains his integrity at all times, and in all places and society, is as separate from the world as God ever designed any man to be. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 490.27*

Compare for a moment *Romans 4:11* and *Genesis 17:11*. In the latter text we learn that circumcision was a token or seal of the covenant which God made with Abraham. In the former we learn that it was a sign or seal of righteousness. Therefore we are forced to conclude that the covenant with Abraham was a covenant of righteousness. This is confirmed by *Romans 4:13*: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Now note: (1) The possession which was promised to Abraham was not confined to the small territory of Canaan, which the Jews afterwards occupied. Canaan was designed only as the beginning of that possession. The promise can never be considered as completely fulfilled until the seed of Abraham, together with Abraham himself, occupy the whole earth. This is in harmony with the words of the apostle, that Joshua did not give the Jews the promised rest or inheritance, and that therefore there remains a rest to the people of God. *Hebrews 4:8, 9. SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.1*

2. The covenant with Abraham involved this possession. The covenant assured to Abraham the inheritance of this earth for an everlasting possession. Compare *Genesis 17:7-11* and *Romans 4:11-13*. But the covenant was a covenant of righteousness. Therefore the promise made to Abraham comprehended nothing less than the new heavens and the new earth, for which we also, in accordance with that promise, look. *2 Peter 3:13*. So the covenant with Abraham included righteousness and eternal redemption, and the everlasting possession of the earth. This is for all who have the same faith that Abraham had. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.2*

"For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise of no effect." *Romans 4:14*. This does not mean that faith is made void and the promise of no effect if those who keep the law are heirs; for none others are heirs. The inheritance is to those who are righteous, who have the righteousness of faith. Faith establishes the law and its righteousness. But it means that the mere possession of the law and the trusting in it for justification cannot constitute one an heir. If it could, then there would be no such things as heirship by faith. And it is easy to see how in that case the promise would be of no effect. Thus: If God has promised

an inheritance on the sole ground of faith (a working faith, of course), and then requires us to work and earn that inheritance, the promise amounts to nothing. But all the promises of God are in Christ Jesus yea and amen; therefore the inheritance comes through the righteousness of faith.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.3*

“Because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression.” *Romans 4:15*. This is positive proof that the inheritance cannot come through the law, but must be by faith. The law gives the knowledge of sin; we have already learned that all have sinned; but the law works wrath to the transgressor; therefore all are condemned. Now here is the broad earth, which is the promised inheritance. Here is a man who ignores the promise of God, and proceeds to work out his title to a portion of the land. The time of judgment comes, and he thinks that he has worked enough to enable him to “prove up” on his claim, and he goes to the court to have the inheritance forever confirmed to him. But now he finds his mistake, for the law in which he had trusted declares that his life is forfeited as a rebel, and, instead of getting an inheritance, he loses his life.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.4*

“Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations), before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.” *Romans 4:16, 17. SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.5*

This is the great ground of confidence. The inheritance is of faith, that it might be by grace; therefore anybody can have a share in it. What if the law has declared our lives forfeited? “Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us (for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree); that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” *Galatians 3:13, 14. SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.6*

What a blessing! And what assurance we may have that we shall

share in it! The blessing is an inheritance in the new earth, which will never be defiled with unrighteousness. God's holy will-his law-will be done in it even as it is now done in heaven. But we have all sinned, and are under the curse of the law-doomed to eternal death. How then can we hope for a share in the everlasting inheritance?-Through the unbounded mercy of God in Christ. Christ has taken upon himself the curse of the law for those who believe,- he bore our sins in his own body on the tree,-and so the promise to Abraham may be as sure to us as though we had never violated the law. "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift!" *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.7*

A law is in force until it is repealed. The repeal, in justice, should be given as wide a publicity as the enactment of the law. These are simple principles recognized in all the governmental affairs of man. Apply the same principles to the decalogue, the law of God. It existed from the beginning. It was solemnly spoken by the Majesty of Heaven in a voice which shook the earth; it was written by his own finger on tables of enduring stone; it was complete in itself. It is repeatedly declared to be perfect, sure, good, true, righteous, everlasting, throughout the Old Testament. Jesus, in the New Testament, declares that he came not to destroy it, and that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail. *Matthew 5:17-20; Luke 16:17*. The psalmist declares (*Psalms 119:172*) that it is God's righteousness, and the Lord says through his prophet that his "righteousness shall not be abolished." *Isaiah 51:6, 7*. In the light of these simple principles and plain declarations of Scripture, how can man say that the Sabbath has been changed or abolished? Why is it not better to believe God? *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.8*

**"Law in Force" The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

A law is in force until it is repealed. The repeal, in justice, should be given as wide a publicity as the enactment of the law. These are simple principles recognized in all the governmental affairs of man. Apply the same principles to the decalogue, the law of God. It existed from the beginning. It was solemnly spoken by the Majesty

of Heaven in a voice which shook the earth; it was written by his own finger on tables of enduring stone; it was complete in itself. It is repeatedly declared to be perfect, sure, good, true, righteous, everlasting, throughout the Old Testament. Jesus, in the New Testament, declares that he came not to destroy it, and that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail. *Matthew 5:17-20; Luke 16:17*. The psalmist declares (*Psalms 119:172*) that it is God's righteousness, and the Lord says through his prophets that his "righteousness shall not be abolished." *Isaiah 51:6, 7*. In the light of these simple principles and plain declarations of Scripture, how can man say that the Sabbath has been changed or abolished? Why is it not better to believe God? *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.9*

**"The Parable of the Vineyard. International Lesson Notes. *Luke 20:9-19*"**  
**The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

### **INTERNATIONAL LESSON NOTES.** **(*Luke 20:9-19*; October 5, 1890.)**

THE CONNECTION.-The speaking of this parable (see also *Matthew 21:3-46; Mark 12:1-12*) came the next day after the events recorded in the last regular lesson. It was the last great day of our Saviour's teaching in the temple. On Sunday he had ridden into Jerusalem as a conqueror. On Monday he had driven out of the temple the extortionate and covetous who were defiling with their unholy traffic the temple of God. Other events, such as the cursing of the fig-tree, the lesson of the prayer of faith, the crafty scheme of the scribes and Pharisees to entrap Jesus with artful questions, and the parable of the two sons, preceded the parable of the vineyard, and can be studied with profit. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.10*

This one fact is nearly always prominent in the Lord's parables, he uses as his illustrations things with which the people were familiar. In this parable, our Lord simply uses that which his Spirit had inspired some hundred years before. See *Isaiah 5:1-7*. The vineyard represents Israel; the tower, the temple at Jerusalem; the

place of resort, the strength and center of their worship, the place from which the whole vineyard could be overseen. The wine-press evidently includes all those means which God gave Israel by which the riches of their vineyard could be developed and used to God's glory. This vineyard was "hedged about," separated from other fields. Israel was a separated people. That which separated them was God's truth-his law, his statutes, his promises to the fathers: "Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them; that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, spew you not out. And ye shall not walk in the manners of the nations, which I cast out before you; for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them. But I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey; I am the Lord your God, which have separated you from other people." *Leviticus 20:22-24.SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.11*

The one who planted the vineyard is the Lord; the husbandmen were those in responsible places in the Jewish nation. And truly what great things God had done for his people! From the time of his first call to them in Egypt till they were cast off forever, the way was strewn with the mercies of God. Truly the Lord could say: "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" *Isaiah 5:4.SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.12*

The householder sent his servants to the husbandmen; the Lord sent his prophets to Israel. It was Samuel, and Elijah, and Isaiah, and Ezekiel, and Jeremiah, and many others. But as the husbandmen beat the servants of the owner of the vineyard, so Israel abused the prophets of God. The record is very explicit on this point: "And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling-place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy." *2 Chronicles 36:15, 16.SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.13*

God left them without excuse. He sent "betimes" to them, or, as the margin reads, "rising up continually and carefully and sending." He

could not let them go. The language of God's heart was: "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together." *Hosea 11:8*. These are the pleadings of Infinite Love to rebellious and fallen man. He will not yet reject Israel. He has one more evidence of his love; he will bestow that; surely they will yield him his due then. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.14*

Then the Lord of the vineyard sends his only begotten Son for the love which he bore to the world. *John 3:16*. Christ "gave himself." *Titus 2:14*. Heaven or the universe could bestow no more; it bestowed its Maker. He who with the Father created all things, laid aside his glory and came to earth, and endured what man must endure, was tempted, tried, and suffered for man's sake. "He came unto his own," but, sad to say, "his own received him not." The Jewish nation had closed their hearts against him. They continually read the prophecies which foretold his coming; they continually offered those sacrifices which typified his death, but the antitype they knew not. Their heart was not in harmony with the message of meekness and humility and heart righteousness; therefore they could not receive him. *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.15*

But they said, "This is the heir; come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours." And this is just what the Jews did. Strange madness, that such should be the case, and yet it was, after three and one-half years of teaching such as the world never heard. No charge could be brought against it, neither could they bring aught against his life. He could say without boasting, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" He met in himself all the specifications of the prophecy. He went beyond this. The mighty power of God was manifested by him wherever he went. The crowning miracle of raising to life him who had been dead four days had but recently been wrought. Lazarus was known to the priests and many about Jerusalem. This miracle, in connection with all the evidences of Christ's divinity which preceded, had led a multitude to believe in him. In fact, no evidences were wanting. The priests had confessed that the "world" had "gone after him." *SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.16*

But notwithstanding all this, the Jews cast him out and crucified him, after a heathen governor had repeatedly declared, "I find no fault in him." In rejecting Christ, the Jews filled up the cup of their iniquity.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.17*

This is the lesson of the parable, from which, according to the account by Matthew, the Jews themselves drew the lesson: "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons." Then our Lord forced home the lesson of the parable by a reference to a well-known scripture: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner."*SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.18*

When the temple of Solomon was built, the stones were all prepared in the quarry, so that no sound of tool was heard in the building. It is said that one stone was for a long time rejected by the builders as of no use; but it was finally ascertained that it was the chief corner-stone. This stone typified Christ. Rejected of men, but chosen of God and precious, he was the tried upon whom if anyone believed he would not be ashamed or confounded.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.19*

"Whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken." Whosoever comes before God with a "broken and contrite spirit" (*Psalms 51:17*), falling unreservedly upon his mercy, will be received. The brokenness is the brokenness of heart so pleasing to God. He dwells with the humble (*Isaiah 57:15*); God looks with favor upon the contrite of heart (*Isaiah 66:2*). But whosoever rejects the mercies of God, will, like the Jews, be rejected of God. If they will not receive Christ as a Redeemer, they must meet him as Judge, when he dispenses judgment without mercy. The lesson for the Jews is a lesson for us all. Let us heed the lesson.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 498.20*

**"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 16, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is often said that the ten divisions into which Rome was divided in



the third and fourth centuries is denoted by the toes on the great metallic image of the second chapter of Daniel. But this is not the case. The prophecy expressly shows that the division of the Roman Empire is not denoted by the toes, but by the intermingling of the iron and the clay. "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." *Daniel 2:41*. Iron and clay will not mix and become homogeneous. They will not unite. There is division wherever the two materials exist. Even so the divisions of the Roman Empire will "not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." *Verse 43.SITI September 29, 1890, page 500.1*

It is a precious thought that God not only helps a man after he becomes a Christian, but he helps him to begin the work. No man can lift up himself. The hymn is true; Jesus must take us just as we are.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 500.2*

"Just as I am, poor, wretched, blind,-  
Sight, healing, riches of the mind.-  
Yea, *all I love in thee to find*,  
O Lamb of God, I come, I come."*SITI September 29, 1890, page 500.3*

Christ says, "Without me, ye can do nothing." We are literally "without strength." Furthermore, Jesus says, "No man can come unto me except my Father draw him." But, praise God, he draws all men. He desires all men to be saved. He calls to all the ends of the earth, "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth." God invites by his Spirit, by his word, by his servants. He draws us by the manifest exhibitions of his love; he gives us strength to accept the invitation and come; he freely accepts us when we come. The strength, the power, the glory, are all God's. Man has naught of which to boast.*SITI September 29, 1890, page 500.4*

In Europe we hear of the "English Sabbath," and the "Continental Sabbath;" in America, the "Puritan Sabbath" and the "American Sabbath;" and now the *Australian Christian World* is calling for an "Australian Sabbath." If all these dear people would believe God and accept of his word, they would get along with one Sabbath-the Sabbath of the Lord our God. God is a God of Gentiles as well as

Jews. *Romans* 3:29. His Sabbath is not local; it “was made for man,” for the race. *Mark* 2:27. But it belongs not to man or country, it is God’s “holy day.” *Isaiah* 58:13. *SITI* September 29, 1890, page 500.5

The *Presbyterian* mourns the growing disposition in the country to exclude the Bible from the public schools, and says: “The conscience must be trained as well as the intellect.” “In Australia, men of observation, influence, and position...are calling for suitable religious instruction in their public schools.” This is strange talk for a religious journal. What are churches and Sunday-schools for? For what are fathers and mothers? But if the church and home cannot give sufficient moral instruction, how will the public schools, which are furnished and fed from the home, be able to do this? They will never be higher morally than the elements they may be made. The public schools are not founded for moral and religious training. It is utterly impossible for them to fulfill the requirement. It is one of the follies of National Reform that such a thing could be thought feasible. *SITI* September 29, 1890, page 500.6

The *Union Signal* of August 28 has the following item: “Mrs. J. C. Bateham has returned to San Francisco from her very successful work for Sabbath observance in the Sandwich Islands.” Of which we have to say: (1) Mrs. Bateham not only does not “work for Sabbath observance,” but she is doing all she can against all true Sabbath observance; and (2) unless her work in the Sandwich Islands was vastly different from her work in the city of Oakland, she counts her success wholly by faith. But perhaps the islanders were more profoundly impressed by her profound ignorance of the question with which she presumes to deal. *SITI* September 29, 1890, page 500.7

## October 6, 1890

“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

God is not confined to one land or territory or country. Jesus died for the world; and he who has the Spirit of Christ will be one upon whose heart lies the burden of evangelizing the world. Oh, for larger hearts! Oh, for more of the Spirit of Christ to enlarge our hearts!*SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.8*

There are ten million pupils in the Sunday-schools of the country. A better showing ought to be made in orals, but the fact is thousands leave the Sunday-school for the saloon, and the downward path in other directions. There is certainly a failure somewhere.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.9*

The Minneapolis ministers look upon the intention of the coming International Exposition management to open the ground on Sunday “as most unwise for the enterprise, contrary to the wishes of millions entitled to respect, and in direct opposition to the word of God. We sincerely appeal to the commissioners in charge to protect this day of rest.” It might be well to ask these commissioners how an open fair on Sunday would be worse than an open fair on Monday, according to the word of God. The true Sabbath of the Lord needs no such “protection.”*SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.10*

The giving of the gospel of Christ to the world, the conversion of souls, will never be accomplished by elaborate system or increased machinery, or the multiplication of societies. We have Christian associations of young men and young women. We have societies of Christian Endeavor; we have W. C. T. U.’s, and Y. W. C. T. U.’s, and King’s Daughters, and no one knows how many other societies. Every additional society is confession on the part of that church within whose pale it is organized that the work of that church fails to meet the divine requirement. Organization according to God’s plan, thorough and complete, is good; but it cannot convert souls. “Power comes from God.” It is not by might or by strength or by power or by wisdom of man that souls will be saved, but by the power of the

Spirit of God. That Spirit will be given to him who seeks faithfully, earnestly, and in God's way. *SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.11*

The following from the *Lutheran Witness* of September 7 shows the trend of the English High Church: *SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.12*

"A priest of the Anglican Church proposed the question, whether the bishop of Lincoln, who is arraigned before the court of the primate of England for ritualistic practices, has not the right of appealing to the pope, the 'patriarch' of the whole church? The priest, who is the spokesman for many others, maintains that the thirty-nine articles refuse to acknowledge the temporal, but not the spiritual, jurisdiction of the pope in England. This certainly proves that the ritualistic high-church men of the established Episcopal Church of England are only Jesuits in disguise." *SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.13*

The Pope is becoming the great pacifier of the nations, and it looks as though he might soon be of the churches. *SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.14*

**"That Blessed Hope" The Signs of the Times, 16, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

"But I would not that ye should be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." There are several points that may be noted on this text: 1. Those who are dead are represented as asleep. The term is very common in the Bible. Read *Job 7:21; Daniel 12:John 11:11-14*, etc. The righteous are asleep in Jesus. 2. This being the case, it follows that the dead are unconscious, for a sleeping man knows nothing of what is going on around him. The general tenor of the inspired writings is in harmony with this idea. For examples see *Job 14:14-21; Psalm 6:5; 88:1-12; 115:17; 146:3, 4; Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, 10*. 3. It is folly to say that we cannot know anything of the future. Paul said that he would not have his brethren ignorant; if we believe his words, we must admit that something can be known of man's future. 4. It is not wrong for Christians to sorrow; the only sin is in

giving away to uncontrollable grief, as did the heathen. They, having no hope, indulged in the most extravagant expressions of sorrow-tearing out the hair, rending their garments, uttering loud shrieks, cutting their flesh, etc. A Christian's grief may be even more acute than that of the heathen, for Christianity tends to elevate, and to quicken the sensibilities, but it will always be tempered by hope.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.15*

"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." From what place will God bring them? "From heaven," many persons say. But the apostle says that those whom he brings have been *asleep*, and if the view of our friends be true, it must be that the saints in heaven do nothing but sleep, and that is absurd. The psalmist says, "In thy presence is fullness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." We think it will need no argument to convince any rational person that David's conception of "fullness of joy" and "pleasures forevermore" would not be met by a long period of unconscious sleep. Those who are asleep are in the grave, and from thence God will bring them, even as he did our Lord. Just as surely as Jesus died and rose again, so surely will God raise from the dead all the sleeping saints.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.16*

"For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [precede] them which are asleep." Paul says, "we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." From this some have supposed that Paul expected that the Lord would come in a very few years, and that he would live until that event; but this was not his expectation. We must believe him when he says, "For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*." Paul received his instruction directly from heaven. Now to say that Paul was mistaken in regard to the time of Christ's second advent, is equivalent to saying either that he was not inspired, or that the Holy Spirit was mistaken. Neither of these positions can be taken by those who believe the Bible. That Paul had a correct idea of the time of the second advent, is clear from *2 Thessalonians 2:1-8*. In his vivid narrative, Paul speaks of things to come as though they were present.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.17*

The word “prevent” is from the Latin words *pre*, before, and *venio*, to go, meaning “to go before,” and was formerly used in this sense. It is so used in King James’ version. See *Psalm 88:13; 119:147, 148*. But as one who went before another was able to “head him off,” as it is commonly expressed, the word finally became restricted to the present signification, to hinder. The Revised Version has the passage in harmony with modern usage. The word “conversation” is another word whose signification has been thus changed. It now means simply familiar talk; but in the Bible it has an entirely different meaning, being applied to one’s manner of life. *SITI October 6, 1890, page 500.18*

“For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” We cannot regard this text in any other way than as a description of an actual occurrence to take place in the future. If the expression “the Lord himself” does not mean Jesus Christ in person, but is a figure of something else, what words could the apostle have used to express the reality? If this be figurative language, then there is no literal language in the Bible. It agrees, however, with the words which the angel spoke to the disciples at the ascension of Christ. *Acts 1:9-11*. This last clause of the verses quoted settles an important point: “And so shall we ever be with the Lord.” How shall we be with the Lord?—By the descent of Christ to raise the dead and change the living. Can we not be with him before that time?—No; for so he told his disciples when on earth. The ardent Peter said, “Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake” (*John 13:27*); but still Jesus did not reverse his former sentence: “As I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you.” Then he comforted them with these words: “In my Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” This is the “blessed hope;” with these words the apostle Paul commanded Christians to comfort one another. Men should be careful how they attempt to improve on the methods laid down by inspiration. *SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.1*

Some time ago a religions journal of note made an admission on this text, that was fatal to the popular view (the one which it also holds), that all men have inherited immortality. It said: "It is hard for us to understand how those converts could have imagined that it was peculiarly unfortunate to die before Christ's second coming. It was because they imagined, and Paul too, perhaps, that Christ was to come soon, in the life-time of some of them [we have already shown that he did not imagine any such thing], and that his coming was physical; and they did not understand the doctrine of the immortality of the soul." That is, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is so opposed to the doctrine of Christ's second coming that those who hold to the former necessarily ignore the latter. We believe that this is the case. But the doctrine of Christ's second coming is one of the most prominent in the whole Bible, and it must therefore follow that the Bible is opposed to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It was well said that "they did not understand the doctrine of the immortality of the soul;" but if Paul and his co-laborers did not understand nor teach it, whence is it that our modern teachers have learned so much about it? Have they a later revelation in which inspiration has corrected its former mistakes? Away with a doctrine which leads men thus to treat God's word. Such teachers would do well to ponder upon Paul's words to the Galatians brethren. *Galatians 1:8.SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.2*

"But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." No argument can be drawn from this to prove that Christians cannot know anything about the Lord's coming, for the next verse shows that he comes as a thief only to those who cry, "Peace and safety,"-those who are not watching. The brethren, Paul states, are not watching. The brethren, Paul states, are not in darkness that that day should overtake them as a thief. Christ gave his disciples very full instructions in regard to the times and the seasons (see *Matthew 24*), and as the whole gospel was revealed to Paul by the Lord himself, he had imparted the same information to the Thessalonian brethren. The prophecies of the Old Testament, especially the book of Daniel, give much light on the times and the seasons.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.3*

O n 1 *Thessalonians 5:10*, Dr. Barnes makes the following comment:-*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.4*

“‘Whether we wake or sleep.’ Whether we are found among the living or the dead when he comes. The object here is to show that the one class would have no advantage over the other. This was designed to calm their minds in their trials, and to correct an error which seems to have prevailed in the belief that those who were found alive when he should return, would have some priority over those who were dead. ‘Should live together with him.’ The word rendered ‘together’ is not to be regarded as connected with the phrase ‘with him,’ as meaning he and they would be together, but it refers to those who wake and those who sleep, those who are alive and those who are dead,-meaning that they would be *together*, or would be with the Lord *at the same time*; there would be no priority or precedence.”*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.5*

That is exactly the truth on this important subject. Happy would it be for Christianity if the churches had never departed from it. E. J. W.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.6*

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago, under the heading “Destroying the Foundations,” we made a few comments on the course adopted by some, of rejecting the five books of Moses, and with them necessarily the whole Bible, in order to get rid of the seventh-day Sabbath. To some it may seem strange that any should pull down a house, foundation and all, in order to get rid of one piece of timber; but such a course is very significant. The Sabbath is so interwoven with the whole of divine revelation that it cannot be removed without undermining the whole structure. The Sabbath is based on the facts of creation; and it cannot be abolished until it can be proved that God did not create the heavens and earth in six days and rest the seventh.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.7*

There is but one mention of Jesus sleeping in all the record of his life. This was not in the quiet of mountain retreat, or in the homes of



friends, but, strangest place of all, it was in a storm at sea, when those who had followed the sea all their lives were in mortal terror, the storm having continued till the ship was full of water. Jesus was asleep. The waves might roll, the storm rage, but the Master of the universe could not be destroyed. "No water can swallow the ship where lies the Master of ocean and earth and skies." Is not this a lesson of comfort and trust to the child of God? If Jesus is with us, though he seems to be sleeping, we are safe, whatever may take place. If we continue to trust, in God's time he will allay the storm.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.8*

A Christian cannot grow unless he partakes of spiritual food. He may be indeed a child of God, his sins all forgiven, his heart changed; but to maintain this relation, to make progress in divine life, in other words, to grow to the stature of a full-grown man in Christ Jesus, he must partake of the required food. That food is the word of God. The "sincere milk of the word" will cause the young Christian to thrive even as the healthful child thrives on its natural food. *1 Peter 2:2*. Jeremiah says: "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart." *Jeremiah 15:16*. And as we must partake of daily physical food in order to maintain strength, so daily the child of God should seek God's word, listen to his voice, appropriate it to himself and his condition, and make it a part of his very being.*SITI October 6, 1890, page 506.9*

## October 13, 1890

**“Front Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

Nowhere in God's word are the people of God promised a reward at death. Death is ever treated as an enemy. Those who die are in the enemy's land (*Jeremiah 31:16*); death is the last enemy to be destroyed (*1 Corinthians 15:26*); it will be destroyed at last in the lake of fire (*Revelation 20:14*). The promise of God is that those who believe in him will be raised up in “the last day.” *John 6:40*. Again, Jesus says: “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and *then* he shall reward every man according to his works.” *Matthew 16:27*. The coming of Christ is that great event around which cluster the brightest and best hopes of Christians,—life, joy, peace, a kingdom incorruptible, forevermore; and all these come through the presence of Christ. Glad day! why should not the child of God love it and long for it? *SITI October 13, 1890, page 506.10*

**“For Our Sake Also. *Romans 4:17-25*” The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The fourth chapter of Romans is one of the richest in the Bible, in the hope and courage which it contains for the Christian. In Abraham we have an example of righteousness by faith, and we have set before us the wonderful inheritance promised to those who have the faith of Abraham. And this promise is not limited. The blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles as well as on the Jews; there is none so poor that he may not share it, for “it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed.” *SITI October 13, 1890, page 506.11*

The last clause of the seventeenth verse is worthy of special attention. It contains the secret of the possibility of our success in the Christian life. It says that Abraham believed “God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were.” This marks God's power; it involves creative

power. God can call a thing which is not as though it existed. If a man should do that, what would you call it?-A lie. If a man should say that a thing is, when it is not, it would be a lie. But God cannot lie. Therefore when God calls these things that be not, as though they were, it is evident that that makes them be. That is, they spring into existence at his word. We have all heard, as an illustration of confidence, the little girl's statement that "if ma says so, it's so if it isn't so." That is exactly the case with God. Before that time spoken of as "in the beginning," there was a dreary waste of absolute nothingness; God spoke, and instantly worlds sprang into being. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.... For he spake, and it was; he commanded, and it stood fast." *Psalm 33:6-9*. This is the power which is brought to view in *Romans 4:17*. Now let us read on, that we may see the force of this language in this connection. Still speaking of Abraham, the apostle says:-*SITI October 13, 1890, page 506.12*

"Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, so shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about a hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb; he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness." *Romans 4:18-22.SITI October 13, 1890, page 506.13*

Here we learn that Abraham's faith, in God, as one who could bring things into existence by his word, was exercised with respect to his being able to create righteousness in a person destitute of it. Those who look at the trial of Abraham's faith as relating simply to the birth of Isaac, and ending there, lose all the point and beauty of the sacred record. Isaac was only the one in whom his seed was to be called, and that seed was Christ. See *Galatians 3:16*. When God told Abraham that in his seed all nations of the earth should be blessed, he was preaching the gospel to him (*Galatians 3:8*), therefore Abraham's faith in the promise of God was direct faith in Christ as the Saviour of sinners. This was the faith which was

counted to him for righteousness.*SITI October 13, 1890, page 506.14*

Now note the strength of that faith. His own body was already virtually dead from age, and Sarah was in a like condition. The birth of Isaac from such a pair was nothing less than the bringing of life from the dead. It was a symbol of God's power to quicken to spiritual life those who are dead in trespasses and sins. Abraham hoped against hope. There was no human possibility of the fulfillment of the promise; everything was against it, but his faith grasped and rested upon the unchanging word of God, and his power to create and to make alive. "And therefore it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Now for the point of it all:-*SITI October 13, 1890, page 506.15*

"Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." *Romans 4:23-25. SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.1*

So Abraham's faith was the same that ours must be, and in the same object. The fact that it is by faith in the death and resurrection of Christ that we have the same righteousness imputed to us that was imputed to Abraham, shows that Abraham's faith was likewise in the death and resurrection of Christ. All the promises of God to Abraham were for us as well as for him. Indeed, we are told in one place that they were specially for our benefit. "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself." "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." *Hebrews 6:13, 17, 18.* Our hope, therefore, rests upon God's promise and oath to Abraham, for that promise to Abraham, confirmed by that oath, contains all the blessings which God can possibly give to man.*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.2*

But let us make this matter a little more personal before leaving it.

Trembling soul, say not that your sins are so many and that you are so weak that there is no hope for you. Christ came to save the lost, and he is able to save to the uttermost those that come to God by him. You are weak, but he says, "My strength is made perfect in weakness." *2 Corinthians 12:9*. And the inspired record tells us of those who "out of weakness were made strong." *Hebrews 11:34*. That means that God took their very weakness and turned it into strength. In so doing he demonstrates his power. It is his way of working. For "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence." *1 Corinthians 1:27-29*. *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.3*

Have the simple faith of Abraham. How did he attain to righteousness?—By not considering the deadness and powerlessness of his own body, but by being willing to grant all the glory to God, strong in faith that he could bring all things out of that which was not. You, therefore, in like manner, consider not the weakness of your own body, but the power and grace of our Lord, being assured that the same word which can create a universe, and raise the dead, can also create in you a clean heart, and make you alive unto God. And so you shall be a child of Abraham, even a child of God by faith in Christ Jesus. E. J. W. *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.4*

**"A Superficial Age" The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian at Work* of September 18 has some severe strictures on the public schools which we are inclined to think are generally true, not because the schools are public schools, but because they are conducted according to the spirit of the age. The above journal says: *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.5*

"In the opinion of thoughtful persons are public schools are by no means what they ought to be. The subjects of study are too multiplied, the time given to each too meager and inadequate. The

system of ‘cramming,’ by which a pupils memory for mere words is developed abnormally and at the expense of his faculties of discrimination and sound judgment, now so popular and almost universal, is an utter perversion of the true conception of education. It transforms a bright boy or girl into a temporary parrot, ready to astonish every hearer with a seemingly brilliant performance, which, however, upon further attention, it turns out to be little more than a species of clipped and empty-headed gabbie. There is in all this no grasp of the underlying principles, no comprehension of the nature of things, no real intellectual and symmetrical training. It is exactly in the mental constitution what a course of gymnastics would be in the physical which should take infinite pains to exercise the muscles of one arm and should leave those of the other arm, chest, back, and legs, entirely inactive and undeveloped. In both cases a monstrosity is the result.” *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.6*

Superficiality is the fault of the age-superficial education, superficial politics, superficial philosophy, superficial theology, and, worse than all, superficial religion. Our fathers, who had but few books and newspapers, who knew scarcely anything of the light literature of to-day, studied more, thought more, meditated more, and laid a better foundation for character in abiding principles which but few of the youth of this generation know. But, as the *Christian at Work* points out, character is more necessary than all else. Parents, see to it that your boys and girls are laying the foundation of character beneath the surface, on the principles of truth, justice, and integrity, and love of God. Days now will count years by and by. *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.7*

**“Unprofitable” The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

From the *Interior* of October 2 we clip the following question and answer:-*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.8*

“*Dear Interior:* Please give me some points and scriptural quotations and arguments by which I may answer the seventh-day Adventists, and thus defend our Sabbath as the first day of the week. A. S. *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.9*

"If these people will not accept the apostolic example of setting apart the Lord's day for worship-if they set themselves against the church from the beginning, and refuse to give the supreme honor to Christ, 'neither would they believe though one should rise from the dead.' We do not think it profitable to argue with such." *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.10*

There are thousands of people who are seeking for the same light and knowledge, who are getting nothing in return. Notice that the *Interior* does not quote the words of Christ: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." No; for "Moses and the prophets" give no sanction to Sunday-keeping. So the *Interior* parodies the words of Christ, putting tradition and custom in the place of the Scriptures. But if it ignores Moses and the prophets, surely it ought to allow some weight to the words of Jehovah: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." To be sure, the *Interior* assumes that the apostles, putting themselves above their Lord, set apart the first day of the week for rest and worship; but it wisely refrains from attempting to give the scriptural quotations which would establish the fact. *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.11*

It talks about refusing to give supreme honor to Christ. Let us see wherein Christ is honored. Is by observing a day that commemorates nothing, and concerning which he has made no command? or by obey his commandment, and observing the day which commemorates creation completed, and thus honors Christ as the divine Creator? No one can acknowledge Christ's divinity without acknowledging him as Creator; and everyone who acknowledges him as Creator, must, to be consistent, acknowledge that He who created also rested upon the seventh day, and blessed and sanctified it, so that the seventh day is the only Lord's day. Therefore to accuse Christ of changing the day of the Sabbath (a thing impossible to do), is to array Christ against himself. *SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.12*

At first our thought was, What a pity that religious papers, which set themselves as guides, should put off an earnest inquirer with such an evasion, as the *Interior* has done; but on second thought it seemed as though good might come of it. A virtual acknowledgment

that there are no “scriptural quotations and arguments” by which Seventh-day Adventists may be answered and the first-day sabbath defended, is far better than to jumble a lot of irrelevant texts together, and claim that they make out a case. The *Interior* is right; it is indeed not profitable to argue against the Bible declaration that the seventh day is the Sabbath.*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.13*

**“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 16, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

Brother Grant Adkins and wife, who have labored in tent work in California this last season, left this city the 6th inst. To labor with Elder J. W. Scoles in Tennessee. Tennessee has, in the last four years, made herself notorious by her oppressive Sunday laws, but she has many honest souls who are longing for truth and light.*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.14*

The time to trust God is not by and by, but *now*. How often do we hear Christians say: “I will trust the Lord,” “I will give myself to him,” “I am going to do better by God’s grace,” all of which look forward to the future. The time to trust God is *now*, the time to give ourselves to God is *now*; the time to do by his grace is *now*. “God is a very *present* help” to all who believe him. We only live in the Now; the Future is ours only as it becomes the Now. The name of our God is not I WAS, or I WILL BE, but “I AM”*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.15*

At this writing (October 6), a party of twelve or more design to start the 13th instant for the East. Among these are Elder J. N. Loughborough and wife, Brother Delmer N. Loughborough and wife, Elder Isaac Morrison, Brother D. E. Scoles, Sister Lena Hudson, the senior editor of this journal, Elder E. J. Waggoner, and family, and others. Elder Loughborough will take charge of the Nebraska conference, of which he has been elected president. The many burdens he has borne in California render change and less burdens absolutely necessary to the maintenance of health and life. May God bless him abundantly in his new field. Brother Morrison and Scoles go East to attend the ministers school at Battle Creek, Mich.*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.16*



Dr. E. J. Waggoner will take a prominent part in teaching in the ministers' school at Battle Creek, Mich., this winter. We regret exceedingly to lose his help from this office; in fact, we know not how we could get along without him if it were not for the assurance that our work was God's work, and that he will supply "all our needs." Brother Waggoner will still write for the SIGNS. May God bless him in his many and hard labors there. May we not ask the prayers of our readers that God may bless us here also, and make our publications the means of saving many souls? We are glad to welcome to this coast our old co-laborer in the British field, Elder J. H. Durland, who will assist us much in our work.*SITI October 13, 1890, page 514.17*

**October 20, 1890**

**“Principles and Precepts” The Signs of the Times, 16, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The word “law” is derived from the same root as the words “lie” and “lay,” and primarily has the same meaning. “A law is that which is laid, set, or fixed, like statute, constitution, from Lat. *statuere*.”-*Webster*. And in harmony with this, the same authority gives us the first definition of the word “law,” “A rule of order or conduct established by authority.” It is a favorite saying with those who would make void the law of God while professing allegiance to his word, that the ten commandments are good, but that they are adapted only to fallen beings, and hence cannot bind angels nor redeemed saints, nor even people in this world who have been converted. Let us see how such a theory agrees with the definition of law. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 514.18*

We will suppose that the angels are free from law, and that redeemed saints are to have a like freedom. In that case there would be nothing “laid down” for their guidance-no rule or order of conduct established by authority. In fact, there would be no authority, and each one would act independently of all the others. There would then exist in heaven the same thing that would exist on earth if there were no law, namely, anarchy; for that means “without rule.” But “God is not the author of confusion,” and therefore such a state of things cannot exist in heaven, and if not in heaven, then of course not among the saints still on earth. The case may be stated thus: 1. When there is no law there is anarchy and confusion; there can be nothing else. 2. Confusion cannot exist among God’s people, whether in heaven or on earth. 3. Therefore the people of God are always and everywhere subject to his law. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 514.19*

Seeing that it will not do to claim that any beings are absolutely free from law, the enemies of the truth have invented a specious theory, with which, unfortunately, many firm believers in the law of God have been captivated. It is this: The law, they say, as it exists in the ten commandments hang on the two great principles of love to God

and love to man, and it was these principles alone that existed before the fall, and these alone will be the law for the redeemed. Some there are who claim that these *principles* are all the law is abolished; for it is the same thing in reality, while it has the *appearance* of great deference to the truth of God. Let us examine it. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 514.20*

It is utterly impossible for anyone to be guided by an abstract principle. Certain principles may have a controlling influence on our lives, but they must be embodied in definite precepts. As an illustration, we will relate a portion of a conversation which we once had with a gentleman who claimed that Christians have nothing to do with the ten commandments. The question was asked him, Is there, then, nothing for Christians to do? Answer: "Yes, they must love the Lord." Very good, but how are they to show that they love the Lord? Answer: "By doing what he tells them to do." Well, what is it that contains specific statements of what the Lord requires us to do to show our love for him? Answer: "Young man, I am older than you are." The reader will wonder, as we did, what bearing this had on the subject. It showed that the man saw that the only possible *answer* was, "The law of God," an answer which would not agree with his theory, hence he chose to give none. But the illustration serves to show that principles, to be obeyed, must be embodied in precepts. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 514.21*

Says the beloved disciple, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." *1 John 5:3*. So when we read that the first great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (*Matthew 22:37*), we know that it means nothing more nor less than that it is our first and highest duty to keep, both in letter and in spirit, all those commandments which define our duty to God. In no other way can we show that we love him. In fact, nothing else but that is love for him. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 514.22*

Suppose for a moment that a man were placed here on earth with nothing to serve as a rule of life except the statement that he must love God supremely and his neighbor as himself. He sets out with a firm determination to do his whole duty. But ere long he is found doing something which God abhors. We will suppose that he is

adoring the sun and moon. When reproved for this, he might well reply: "I did not know that I was doing anything wrong; nothing was said to me about this matter. I had a feeling of love and gratitude to God, and did not know how to manifest it in any better way than by paying homage to the most glorious of his created works." By what law could the man be condemned? He could not justly be condemned, because the will of the Creator on that point had not been made known to him, and he could not reasonably be expected to know the will of God if it had not been revealed.*SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.1*

It will be seen by a very little consideration, that to put a man on the earth with nothing but a general command to love God, and at the same time to expect him to do nothing displeasing to God, would be to assume that the man had infinite wisdom. For God is infinite; and if a man, without being told, finds out what God requires, it can only be because he can comprehend infinity. But this is an impossibility. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?-No, indeed; the creature that could know the mind of God any further than it was directly revealed by him, has never existed.*SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.2*

Then since, as we have conclusively proved, there must be a law for all creatures, and since this law must be definitely expressed, and since, moreover, the whole duty of man is to love God above all things, and his neighbor as himself, we are shut up to the conclusion that the ten commandments always have been and always will be the rule of life for all created intelligences. In direct support of this, Solomon says: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." *Ecclesiastes 12:13*. This settles the matter, at least for the present time. John also says that the love of God is to keep his commandments; but it will be our duty to love God to all eternity; therefore it will always be our duty to keep the commandments of God. And it makes it no less a duty because it becomes our highest pleasure. To the natural man, duty is irksome; the object of making him a new creature in Christ is that it may be a pleasure for him to do his duty. Paul says that God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, thus condemning sin in the flesh, in order that the "righteousness [requirements] of the law might be

fulfilled in us." *Romans 8:3, 4*. The object of the gospel is to make us like Christ, who said, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." *Psalms 40:8*. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.3*

In addition to the above, we offer the words of the prayer which Christ has commanded us to pray to God: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." *Matthew 6:10*. Now the will of God is his law. See *Romans 2:17, 18; Psalms 40:8*. We are taught by this prayer, then, that when the kingdom of God is established on this earth, God's law will be kept here even as it is now kept in heaven. And David says, by inspiration, that the angels that excel in strength "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." *Psalms 103:20*. That is, they are anxious and delight to keep God's commandments. Duty is with them a pleasure. And when God's kingdom comes, we also, if permitted to become subjects of it, will delight to do God's will, and will keep all his commandments, of which "every one" "endureth forever." We shall then do perfectly what we now are (or should be) striving to do in spite of the weakness of the flesh. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.4*

This subject will be continued in another article, in which we shall consider the objection that there are certain commandments of the decalogue which angels or glorified saints could not violate if they wished to, and that therefore it is absurd to suppose that obedience to those commandments is required of them. E. J. W. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.5*

**"A Serious 'Drawback'" The Signs of the Times, 16, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer* of October 2 has a letter from its Pacific Coast correspondent, entitled "A Sabbath in San Francisco." After speaking of the flourishing growth and the commercial importance of the city, and of the numerous charities that are liberally sustained, he adds:-*SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.6*

"True, there are some drawbacks here as there are in all the cities of our land. Attractive as the city is, and in its main features very

desirable as a place of residence, yet the good people who have come from the East regret the absence of some things with which they have always been familiar. There are no Sabbath law in California, and no recognition of it on the statute-books of the State. Labor of all kinds can be carried on without hindrance, stores may remain open for the transaction of business as on any other day of the week, places of amusement may be open without interference from the authorities, while noisy demonstrations can go on as usual. But while there is the absence of all Sunday laws, we must not draw the conclusion that there is no respect paid to the Lord's day. Truth compels us to state the fact that San Francisco is a Sabbath-keeping city. The drift is plainly in that direction. The moral sentiment of the people is largely in its favor, and with very rare exceptions you will find as much order and quiet in the streets as in some of our most favored Eastern cities. Those who knew California twenty years ago now witness a far different order of things. The mass of the people respect and keep the Lord's day." *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.7*

We can faintly imagine the pain that must have wrung the heart of the correspondent as truth compelled him to pen the above paragraph. We now understand something of the anxiety with which the hearts of all Sunday-law advocates turn towards California. What zealot for Sunday laws could contemplate such a condition of things as just described, without undergoing anguish of soul? Think of it; in San Francisco, where they have no Sunday law, the Sunday is actually as well observed as in the more favored cities in the East! How dreadful! And what is worse, the Sunday is much better observed than it was twenty years ago, when California had a Sunday law! This is heart-rending! Such a state of things must be changed at all hazards. San Francisco must not be allowed to struggle along, hampered by such "drawbacks." *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.8*

Perhaps some innocent person may ask, "Where is the 'drawback' in not having a Sunday law, and why should its absence be regretted if Sunday is observed in San Francisco as well as in our 'most favored Eastern cities,' and better than it was when California had a Sunday law?" Do you not see? It is not a 'drawback' to the city of San Francisco, but to the cause of religious legislation. Is it

not evident that if this state of things is allowed to continue, people will conclude that Sunday laws are not necessary in order to have Sunday observed? More than this, when truth compels the zealous Sunday-law advocate to admit that Sunday is better observed in San Francisco now than when it had a Sunday law, some impertinent fellows, who have more logic than reverence for bigotry, will soon be claiming that Sunday laws are a detriment to proper Sunday observance. And then the advocates of religious legislation will have no argument except the one which a gentleman who is active in the movement recently used with us, "We are determined to have a Sunday law anyway." What! let people continue to observe Sunday without a Sunday law? Never. That would be worse than to allow sick people to get well without a physician. E. J. W. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.9*

**"Back Page: Sun-god" The Signs of the Times, 16, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

Israel's making of the sun-god, or golden calf, is an emphatic lesson of man's natural depravity. They had promised, but in their own strength, that they would obey God's voice (*Exodus 19:5*), and they were no doubt honest in this; but their hearts were unregenerate, and deceived themselves. A deceived heart turned them aside. *Isaiah 44:20*. The only way by which we can do God's will is to be regenerated-born again-the heart of enmity to God's law taken away, and the new heart given. The only means by which we can keep God's commandments is by his strength, put on through faith in Christ. Every other way, every covenant in our own strength, will, like that of Israel at Horeb, gender to bondage. *Galatians 4:24.SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.10*

Sabbath, October 11, was a good day for the church in Oakland. Elder E. J. Waggoner, who closes his pastorate over this church, covering a period of some years, spoke in the morning, basing his remarks on *2 Corinthians 4*. The prominent thoughts presented were that not alone in the life to come did God reveal to us the blessings and joys of the eternal world, but even now he revealed them to us by his Spirit; that while the glorified people of God will sometime walk in immortality, in the presence of God, in the joys of

the world to come, it was the privilege of the Christian to walk there even now by faith; and that God designed the sufferings even of this present life to work out in us even here an eternal weight of glory through the exceeding riches of his grace. The very things over which the natural man would become discouraged would prove stepping-stones to the Christian, who would come off more than conqueror in the conflict. After the sermon a social meeting was held, in which eighty testimonies were borne in a little over forty minutes, with no dry or prosy ones among them. There were present a part of the crew and some of the missionaries of the ship *Pitcairn*, who hope to sail westward within a week, and Elder J. N. Loughborough and others soon to go eastward to other fields of labor. It was a good day. God grant that all these his people may meet in the glad "harvest home." *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.11*

All departure from God's word means idolatry, and the farther one strays from the letter of his warning or his command, the more flagrant becomes his idolatry. In the very beginning God provided means to guard men against idolatry, but that means has been grossly neglected, with the result that is so fully demonstrated in the history of man. He established at creation a memorial of the creative power of the true God. The one grand distinction between the true God and all false gods is that the true One created the heavens and the earth. No false god has ever claimed, nor was it ever claimed for him, that he created anything. *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.12*

We read in *Exodus 20:11* that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; *wherefore* the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Is it reasonable to suppose that if men had faithfully celebrated this weekly memorial day, they would have come to believe in any other god? See *Ezekiel 20:12*: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." We see, then, that the one object of the Sabbath, was a memorial of the true God. Is there any less necessity for such a safeguard to-day than there was in ancient times? *SITI October 20, 1890, page 522.13*



## October 27, 1890

“Front Page: Golden Rule” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The golden rule as stated by Christ is, “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,” and then he adds that “this is the law and the prophets.” There is certainly no room for religious legislation in the above. Legislation for the support of any religious institution or dogma is anti-christian. Would that this might be learned by all Christians. *SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.14*

Earnestness in seeking God depends upon our sense of need. If we feel self-sufficient, strong in our own strength, wise in our own wisdom, our seeking will to a great extent be in vain. There will come a time in our experience when we will fall, not because God wishes it, but because we trusted in our own strength, and he would teach us that our strength is weakness, and that in him alone is safety found. Blessed is that man who can learn his own weakness and lay hold on God’s strength without falling. *SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.15*

The giving of God’s law was designed not only to impress Israel with a sense of its holiness, but the world itself which should afterward read the record. The manner in which God spoke the law, the terrible majesty attending the events, the way in which it was given, separate and distinct from all others, on tables of enduring stone, -all were designed to show how holy and sacred were the ten words of God, the sum of all morality, the compendium of all righteousness. Here it is said God made known his holy Sabbath. *Nehemiah 9:14*. What is meant by this, seeing that the Sabbath was understood before (*Genesis 2:2, 3; Exodus 16*)? -This, evidently: God knew that men would say that the Sabbath was ceremonial in character, and therefore not binding, as were other moral precepts; therefore he made known its true character by placing it in the very bosom of the decalogue, guarded before and behind by immutable moral precepts, so that men could never with any reason say that the Sabbath was not as binding as the first, or sixth, or any other commandment. The law of God’s rest-day, as of all the other parts

of that law, is immutable and eternal. *SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.16*

**“Salvation—Present and Future” The Signs of the Times, 16, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

There are some scriptural expressions that have been so misused by ignorant and fanatical persons that they have almost fallen into disrepute among sober-minded people. One of these terms is the word “saved,” as applied to an individual in this present life. In a certain class of revivals it is very common to hear persons who have been wrought up to the proper pitch of excitement, testify that they are saved. The more that can be induced to rise and say with greeater or less vehemence, “I am saved,” or who in response to the question, will hold up their hands to that effect, the greater the list of “converts” the revivalist has to report. Now we earnestly deprecate any such methods as this; yet simply because the term “saved” is abused, we ought not to reject it, any more than we would refuse to believe in presence conversion, because the term is used by many people who have not the slightest idea of its meaning. *SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.17*

The word “saved” is frequently used in the Bible in a sense similar to that of “conversion.” Paul says: “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.” *1 Corinthians 1:18*. Here it is used in the present tense, and has no reference to future salvation. Again he says: “Be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God; who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.” *2 Timothy 1:8, 9. SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.18*

To the same intent the word is used in *Titus 3:4-6*:-*SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.19*

“But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward men appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of

regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.”*SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.20*

Other texts might be quoted, but these are sufficient. They show that when one has been forgiven for all his past transgressions,-when the burden of sin that clung to him as a body of death, has been removed,-and a new heart has been given him,-a heart loving righteousness and hating iniquity,-it is proper to say that he is saved. The trouble arises from confounding that salvation with eternal salvation. There is a salvation which is wholly future, as is evident from the following texts:-*SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.21*

“And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” *Matthew 24:12, 13*. Here we learn that those who are converted-saved-must endure to the end if they would be saved.*SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.22*

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.” *1 Peter 1:3-5*. Here again we learn that at “the last time” a salvation is to be brought to those who, having a hope in God through the resurrection of Jesus, endure, through the grace of God, to the end. There is a possibility that this present salvation may not be lasting, that those who have “tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come” (*Hebrews 6:5, 6*), may fall away; but the salvation “to be revealed at the last time” cannot be lost, as is seen by the following text:-*SITI October 27, 1890, page 522.23*

“But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with *an everlasting* salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end.” *Isaiah 45:17*. From this we learn of a salvation that is to be everlasting, that will be shared by Israel-all who overcome. This is the salvation that is to be revealed at the last time.*SITI October 27, 1890, page*

Now, what connection have the two? Simply this, the first is a preparation for the second. One is salvation in the kingdom of grace, and the other is salvation in the kingdom of glory. Paul, in writing to the Colossians, prays that they might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, -*SITI October 27, 1890, page 530.2*

"Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." *Colossians 1:12-14. SITI October 27, 1890, page 530.3*

Here is present salvation, and translation into a kingdom; yet it is not until Christ comes "the second time without sin unto salvation" (*Hebrews 9:28*), sitting upon the throne of his glory, accompanied by all his holy angels, that he says to the righteous: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." *Matthew 25:34*. Now, of those who have been delivered from the powers of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's grace, "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," only those will have an entrance ministered unto them "abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," who heed the exhortation, "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure" (*2 Peter 1:10, 11*), so that they do not fall. *SITI October 27, 1890, page 530.4*

The kingdom of grace receives subjects to be fitted for the kingdom of glory. It saves men from the guilt and the love of sin, clothing them with the divine nature, so that when the Lord shall come in his glory, they may be clothed upon with immortality, which will then be the only thing lacking. But none will share this glory who indulge in vain boasting, or who imagine that a work just begun for them is already done. "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." E. J. W. *SITI October 27, 1890, page 530.5*

## November 3, 1890

**“Life and Death Opposite Terms”** *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

In the last words which Moses at the command of the Lord spoke to the children of Israel, he said:-*SITI November 3, 1890, page 530.6*

“See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; In that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.” *Deuteronomy 30:15-19. SITI November 3, 1890, page 530.7*

In this text we have the most positive evidence that life and death are exactly opposite states. It should be unnecessary to quote anything to prove such a self-evident proposition, yet it is well known that in the face of the statement that “the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord,” many claim that the wicked, as well as the righteous, will have eternal life. If it be true that both righteous and wicked are to have everlasting life, then life and death must mean the same thing, for the Bible says that life is for the righteous and death is for the wicked.*SITI November 3, 1890, page 530.8*

We do not say that it is claimed that the wicked will have life under the same conditions as the righteous. But this we say is contradictory of Scripture. The Scripture promises life to the righteous, and death to the wicked. These terms are unqualified except as to duration,-both are eternal. Therefore, if it be claimed that the wicked will live eternally, it must be claimed that life and

death are identical in meaning. *SITI November 3, 1890, page 530.9*

But the scripture just quoted shows that they are not identical. They are as widely separated as the antipodes. They are no more alike than are blessing and cursing. "See," says the Lord, "I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." Who will claim that good and evil have anything in common? o one certainly who has any regard for God's word. Well, death and life are just as far apart as are good and evil. Life follows good, and death follows evil. Again the Lord says, "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing." Who will say that blessing and cursing are identical terms? There is no question but that they are as far apart as the east is from the west. But life is the blessing wherewith God blesses those who love him, and the curse pronounced upon the disobedient is death. Notice a clause in the last verse of *Deuteronomy 30*. After admonishing the people to cleave unto the Lord, Moses says, "For he is thy life, and the length of thy days." Question-If God is the life of his people, and the length of their days, what will become of those who do not cleave to the Lord? It must be that they will not have life nor length of days. This is what the Bible teaches. Paul says that those who "know not God, and that obey me, the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, "shall" be punished with everlasting destruction." *2 Thessalonians 1:8, 9*. He says again that Christ "hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (*2 Timothy 1:10*), which leads to the conclusion that all who do not accept the gospel will know nothing of life and immortality. *SITI November 3, 1890, page 530.10*

Again, the apostle John says: "He that believeth on the Son hath life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." So far will the unbeliever be from having life, that he shall not see life. And this is literally true. This life amounts to nothing, unless it is used as a preparation for eternal life. It is hard enough at the best. In childhood even, when the world seems brightest and when the spirit is buoyant, there are troubles as great as the child can endure. As age comes on, cares increase, and the words of the patriarch, that "man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upward," are proved to be true. The life which we live in this earth is not real life. There is not a man who knows, even at his best, anything of the freshness and vigor of that life which will be

felt by those who drink of the river of the water of life, and eat of the fruit of the tree of life. Our moment of that life will contain more of vigor and joyous energy than threescore and ten years of this present life. And so the man who rejects God and the gospel, and who consequently is punished with destruction, may truly be said to have never seen life. *SITI November 3, 1890, page 547.1*

Christ is the life-giver. He came to earth and died for no other purpose than that men who were doomed to death might have life. "I am come," said he, "that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." *John 10:10*. To say that we can have eternal life without Christ, is to rob him of his highest honor. Who that loves Christ can refuse to worship him as the giver of our life, as well as of all good things. E. J. W. *SITI November 3, 1890, page 547.2*

## December 1, 1890

“The Love of God” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

God is love. It is not simply that he has love in large measure for his creatures, but he *is* love. He is the embodiment of love. To love is a part of his nature, and this love manifests itself in devising plans for the perfect happiness of all created beings, both in heaven and on earth. It was shown in the garden of delights, Paradise, which he planted upon the earth that was already exceedingly good, for the pleasure of the man whom he had made. And in infinite measure was his love manifested when he gave all that heaven had to bestow for the reclaiming of fallen man. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 547.3*

But while God is love, it is a fact that between man and God there is not perfect harmony. Indeed, in man's natural state there is not the least harmony between him and God. The apostle Paul puts this very emphatically when he says: “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. *Romans 8:7*. It will be noticed from this that the enmity is all on the side of man; the carnal mind is enmity against God. And the cause of this enmity lies in the fact that the law of God, which is the law of love, is regarded by man as a yoke of bondage. God's law is the verbal picture of his pure and holy character; it is an expression of the love that springs naturally from his heart. But “out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, theft, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness.” *Mark 7:21, 22*. Hence the enmity against God. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 547.4*

The prophet Isaiah says, in language that will apply to all men as well as to ancient Israel: “Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come forever and ever; that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord.” *Isaiah 30:8, 9*. This is man's position. “But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more, then, being now justified by



his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” *Romans 5:8-10.SITI December 1, 1890, page 547.5*

Throughout the Bible it will be found that the testimony is the same: the enmity is all on the side of man. This is shown by these words of the apostle:-*SITI December 1, 1890, page 547.6*

“God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.” *2 Corinthians 5:19, 20.SITI December 1, 1890, page 547.7*

This is very emphatic. Man is the enemy of God; God is the friend of mankind, entreating them to become reconciled to him. And the depths of God’s love for the sinful, rebellious world is shown in the next verse: “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” Although the offense was all on the part of man, God has made all the effort possible even to infinite power to have him become reconciled. On the part of man there is enmity; on the part of God there is an infinite tenderness, and a longing to have the rebellious children become reconciled to him.*SITI December 1, 1890, page 547.8*

The same truth concerning the enmity of man and the love of God is brought out in *Colossians 1:19-22*. Speaking of Christ, the apostle says:-*SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.1*

“For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouable in his sight.”*SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.2*

After Christ had suffered for our sins which alienated us from God, he ascended into the heavens, “there to appear in the presence of God for us,” and is now sitting upon his Father’s throne. *Revelation 3:21*. Of his work there the prophet Zechariah thus speaks: *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.3*

“Thus speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” *Zechariah 6:12, 13. SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.4*

This presents a wonderful scene, the Father and the Son counseling together for the peace of mankind, the great mass of whom choose rebellion rather than peace. Instead of loving peace and happiness, they, after their hardness and impenitent hearts, not knowing that the goodness of God leads them to repentance, treasure up unto themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.5*

For a day of wrath will surely come. God is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, but he will not force men to repent and become reconciled. His love draws men to him; but there are many who resist the movings of the Spirit, and will not be drawn. As the same sun that melts the wax also hardens the clay, so the same love that destroys the enmity in some hearts only increases it in others. The simile is of course not perfect, for while it is natural for the clay to become hardened by the sun, it is unnatural for human hearts to be hardened by God’s grace. Hearts could not fail to be melted into tenderness by the tender, unfathomable love of God, if they did not steel themselves against it. And so when even infinite love fails to reconcile the rebellious subjects, there is nothing left but to cut them off as useless cumberers of the ground. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.6*

In two passages of Scripture the long-suffering of God is

represented by the figure of a husbandman trying to develop good fruit from his garden. Says Isaiah:-*SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.7*

“Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill; and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein; and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes.” *Isaiah 5:1, 2.SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.8*

See also *Luke 13:7-9.SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.9*

Thus is shown God’s unwillingness to cut off even the most unfruitful plant, so that he can say: “Judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done to it.” *Isaiah 5:3, 4.* The gnarled, crooked natures of some will resist all the efforts of the faithful husbandman to induce them to bear good fruit, or any fruit at all, and since they bear only thorns and briers, there is nothing to do with them but to burn them. So the Lord says of his unfruitful vineyard:-*SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.10*

“And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will lay it waste; it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briers and thorns; I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it.” *Isaiah 5:5, 6.SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.11*

And of the unfruitful plants he says:-*SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.12*

“Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust; because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” *Verse 24.SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.13*

At that time the counsel of peace between the Father and the Son

will have ceased. The word of reconciliation will no longer be preached, because all will have become reconciled to God who could by any possibility be reconciled. Reconciliation will then give place to controversy, for that time of burning will be “the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion.” *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.14*

The controversy is now between the Lord and Satan for the possession of the souls of men. In proportion as men resist the strivings of God's Spirit, they place themselves on the side of Satan, and become actuated by his spirit. And when by continued sin, and repeated resistance of the Spirit of God, they have finally driven it from them, have blotted out every thought of good, upon which the Holy Spirit could work, then they are wholly Satan's, actuated solely by his wicked spirit. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.15*

Then when men shall have fully identified themselves with Satan, the Lord will have a controversy with them also. Says the prophet, speaking of that time: - *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.16*

“A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations: he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth.” *Jeremiah 25:31-33. SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.17*

“For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” *Malachi 4:1. SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.18*

Thus will the great controversy end. In that day those who have allied themselves fully with Satan, will find out what a hopeless thing it is to fight against God. They will realize that while God is love, his is not the love that is imbecile, but the love that protects. In love to his loyal subjects, who have placed confidence in the

integrity of his government, he must blot out the incorrigibly rebellious ones. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.19*

Says God: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing." "A blessing, if ye obey the commandment of the Lord your God.... and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God." "Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." *Deuteronomy 30:19; 11:27, 28.* Who will make the wise choice, and, through Christ, become reconciled to God and his law? "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." E. J. W. *SITI December 1, 1890, page 570.20*

## December 29, 1890

“How Readest Thou?” *The Signs of the Times*, 16, 51.

E. J. Waggoner

This is as pertinent a question at the present time as it was when the Saviour uttered it. Indeed, there probably was never before a time when there was so much need as now of professed Christians looking to their ground, to see where they stand. It is well understood that there is a great deal of rampant infidelity in the land, but how many realize that that infidelity is only the central portion of the stream, which indicates a strong current in that direction? It is a sad fact that infidelity is creeping-no, not creeping, but stalking boldly, into the church. That this is true, a few extracts picked up at random will suffice to show. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.21*

It is doubtless well known that the great question which is agitating the Methodist Church at the present time is the admission of women as delegates to the General Conference, and their ordination as ministers, which would soon follow. With this controversy we have nothing to do, and do not care at present to express our opinion as to its merits. We simply wish to show how the Bible is regarded by many persons high in church authority and influence. The extracts given will show a general casting off of the authority of the Scriptures. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.22*

Prof. L. T. Townsend, of New York (Presbyterian), contributes a chapter to Miss Frances E. Willard's book, "Woman in the Pulpit," and on page 153, after quoting *1 Timothy 2:11* and *1 Corinthians 14:34, 35*, he says: "It must be perfectly apparent that if the prohibition in these passages is infallible, ...then Miss Willard and her friends may as well first as last retire from the controversy." But Professor Townsend does not think that these texts affect Miss Willard's case, therefore he does not regard them as infallible. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.23*

Take another passage from the same pen, and the disregard, not to say contempt, of the Scriptures will be still more apparent:-*SITI*

*December 29, 1890, page 570.24*

The pastoral epistles were addressed, not to Presbyterians in America, but to two young Jews. The writer of these epistles did not have in mind a thought of American Presbyterians. Why, therefore, do Presbyterians-we include not a few Methodists-speak and act as though they must heed the admonitions of these epistles, going so far as to enforce against women the supposed injunctions of these epistles? Why are they meddling in these affairs?-*Woman in the Pulpit*, pp. 146, 147.*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.25*

Right glad are we that many Presbyterians and Methodists can be accused of regarding the epistles of Paul as authoritative even in these days. It shows that the spirit of the Reformation has not entirely died out.*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.26*

The following two statements are from Methodists, published without signature in the New York *Christian Advocate*. It should be stated that the *Advocate* strongly condemns such utterances:-*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.27*

Paul, who definitely believed when he wrote those scriptures that the world would not even see the second century, much less the nineteenth, was ordering the churches for his own age.*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.28*

So it must be remembered that Paul was a bachelor, and he was writing in the first century, in the midst of heathen surroundings, and endeavoring to be all things to all men, and not infringing upon local laws and customs more than he had to at a time when, as a rule, women had no rights that men were bound to respect.*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.29*

Anyone can see that the same line of argument would rule out all the epistles, as well as the words of Christ, and then what have people to guide them?-Simply their own perverse wills. But let us read another statement from the pen of Miss Willard, whose every utterance is taken as gospel by several hundred thousand professed Christian men and women. She says:-*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.30*

Whoever quotes to the intelligent and devout women of the American church to-day, the specific instructions given by Paul to the illiterate and immoral women of Corinth, does so at the expense of sound judgment, not to say scholarship.-*Women in the Pulpit*, p. 50.*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.31*

So it seems that the test of the value of any portion of Scripture is to be the intelligence of men and women, and their idea as to the necessity for it. If it suite them, it is all right; if it does not, they reject it. Of what value is the Bible to such people? Their own wills are their standard of right and wrong.*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.32*

One more quotation must complete the view of the picture for the present. It is from a correspondent of the *Christian Union*, of July 24, and passes in that paper unchallenged. It is as follows:-*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.33*

I have been interested in reading a criticism of Lyman Abbott, by his brother Edward, and I am impelled to jot down a few thoughts as they have occurred to an outsider. I could not but be surprised that, of the nineteen texts quoted by Edward Abbott, to establish an important, and one generally regarded as an essential, doctrine of Christianity, *only one is from the sayings of its Founder*, and in that one, the language is unquestionably figurative. Will not a higher and truer criticism, before long, come to regard the writings of the apostles to be just what they are, namely, the expression of their *personal* opinions? May they not have been sometimes mistakes? What warrant have we for assuming that Paul, Peter, James, or John were able to draw any truer conclusions from the contents of the four gospels than Lyman Abbott, H. W. Beecher, Dr. Channing, and a thousand others-especially if we accept the claim of Edward Abbott, that the spirit of truth is *now*, as well as has been, in the church?*SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.34*

There you have the result to which all the others are tending if they have not already arrived. It is open infidelity of a large part of the Bible, and virtual rejection of the remainder, since it all stands on the same foundation. It is terrible to contemplate the gross deceptions into which the church will plunge when such ideas



become prevalent; and they are rapidly spreading, for they are entrenched in high places. The book from which the most of these quotations are made, is indorsed in the highest terms by Dr. Joseph Parker, of London, Dr. Talmage, and Joseph Cook. Is this not evidence that the church is on the “down grade”? *SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.35*

But we have not written this simply to expose the infidelity of these men and women. We have written in order that every reader may stop and answer carefully the question at the head of this article. Do you believe the Bible implicitly, or do doubts steal across your mind as you read? The foundation for all this infidelity exists in the mind of everyone who holds the words of Peter, Paul, James, John, Moses, David, Isaiah, or Solomon, recorded in the Scriptures, as of any less authority or truth than those uttered by Jesus in the sermon on the mount. Note the surprise of the writer last quoted, that out of nineteen texts in support of a Christian doctrine, “*only one is from the sayings of its Founder.*” Is a scripture any less the word of God if written by one of the apostles or prophets than if spoken with an audible voice by the Lord himself? Are you, dear reader, in the habit of attributing “degrees” to inspiration, and of considering one passage as more valuable than another, according as it meets *your* approbation? If so, you are in great danger. You say you believe that it is *all true*, although of varying authority and importance. Very well, we accept your statement that you believe the Scriptures, and ask you to accept the following as true: “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” *2 Timothy 3:16, 17. SITI December 29, 1890, page 570.36*

And please remember that in this Bible, all of which you profess to believe, the apostle Paul’s epistles are classed with “the other scriptures.” *2 Peter 3:16.* They were given by inspiration too. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 603.1*

We ask you to believe the statement contained in this verse: “For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as

the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 *Thessalonians* 2:13. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 603.2*

Here is another: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 *Corinthians* 14:37. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 603.3*

That is, the man who does not acknowledge Paul's writings as the commandments of the Lord, is unspiritual. He cannot discern spiritual things. How many are putting their own unspiritual doubts in the place of the holy word of God. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 603.4*

No one can receive from the Scriptures that living power which they are designed to give, unless when he reads them he drops from his mind all thought of the men who penned them, and of their human frailties, and hears only the voice of God. Thus did the apostles regard the Old Testament. For instance, Paul quoted *Isaiah* 6:9, 10 to the unbelieving Jews at Rome, introducing the text thus: "Well spake the Holy Ghost by Aesaia the prophet unto our fathers, saying," etc. *Acts* 28:25. Again, in *Hebrews* 10:15-17 we have a quotation from *Jeremiah* 31:33, in which Jeremiah is not mentioned, but the words are credited to the Holy Spirit. And again, in *Hebrews* 1:8, 9 we have *Psalms* 45:6, 7 quoted, and David is not mentioned, but the words are quoted as addressed by God the Father directly to the Son, without any human agency. They are indeed just as much the word of God as those which were spoken on Mount Sinai, or the Mount of Olives, and the New Testament is not a whit behind the Old. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 603.5*

Let us, then, avoid the beginnings of infidelity. Let us leave no room for doubt to creep into our minds, and this we can do by accepting the whole Bible, not as the word of man, but as the word of God. Then, remembering that "every word of God is pure," let us receive it with humble reverence, and hide it within our hearts. E. J. W. *SITI December 29, 1890, page 603.6*

